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1 Synopsis

1. Tara Devine is a consultant hired by property owners in Venice to implement the formation of a business improvement district (“BID”) in Venice. During the three consecutive months of June, July, and August 2016 she was paid for thirty or more hours of lobbying activity leading up to the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance establishing the BID. During this time she was not registered as a lobbyist with the City, in violation of LAMC 48.07.

2 Background

2.1 Business improvement districts

2. Business improvement districts ("BIDs") are special assessment districts authorized by the Property and Business Improvement District Act of 1994.\(^2\)

3. The process for establishing a BID requires the collection of sufficiently many petitions from property owners to the City.\(^3\) After the receipt of the petitions, the first step that the full City Council takes towards the formation of a BID is to adopt an Ordinance of Intention ("OOI").\(^4\)

4. Before the OOI is passed, the BID proponents prepare a Management District Plan ("MDP"), which must include detailed information about the proposed district.\(^5\) In the case of so-called “property-based BIDs,” the formation process also requires the submission to Council of “a detailed engineers report prepared by a registered professional engineer certified by the State of California supporting all assessments contemplated by the management district plan.”\(^6\)

5. Subsequent to the submission of these documents, a hearing is held at City Council, after which must follow the adoption of a “resolution of formation,” which brings the BID into being. It’s important to note that according to State law, the adoption of the resolution of formation is entirely discretionary even if all the requirements for BID formation are met.\(^7\) Furthermore, state law gives the City Council the power at this hearing both to exclude properties from the BID, to reduce the proposed assessments, and to rewrite the MDP at their pleasure.\(^8\)

6. At some point prior to the establishment of a BID, the proponent property owners must form a private non-profit corporation, the Property Owners’ Association (“POA”), for the purpose of contracting with the City to administer the BID.\(^9\)

\(^2\)California Streets and Highways Code ("S&HC") §36600 et seq.
\(^3\)S&HC §36621.
\(^4\)S&HC §36621(a).
\(^5\)S&HC §36622.
\(^6\)S&HC §36622(n).
\(^7\)S&HC §36625.
\(^8\)S&HC §36624.
\(^9\)S&HC §36612.
2.2 BIDs in Los Angeles

7. In Los Angeles, City responsibilities for the BID formation process are handled through the Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division (“NBID”) of the City Clerk’s office. The division manager of NBID is Miranda Paster. Rita Moreno is a BID analyst in NBID. Garen Yegparian and Mario Montez are staff members in NBID.

8. In Los Angeles, the Council District(s) in which proposed BIDs will be located also play an informal but substantial role in BID formation.

9. In Los Angeles it is an almost universal practice for the POA to hire a private consultant to shepherd the BID formation process through NBID and Council.

2.3 The Venice Beach BID

10. In 2016 the City of Los Angeles approved a property-based BID in Venice, which is wholly within CD11, known as the Venice Beach BID (“VBBID”). The associated POA is known as the Venice Beach POA (“VBPOA”). The VBPOA hired private BID consultant Teresa “Tara” Devine (“Tara Devine”) to handle their BID formation process.

11. Debbie Dyner Harris is the member of CD11 Councilmember Mike Bonin’s staff who had and has responsibility for the CD11 portion of the VBBID formation process. David Graham-Caso is Mike Bonin’s communications director.

12. The VBBID formation process was unusually contentious. According to the Argonaut:

   While other BIDs in L.A. have been challenged and some have been invalidated for various reasons, [City Clerk Holly] Wolcott said the drama surrounding the Venice Beach BID is unprecedented. “Since I’ve been in office, we’ve never seen the level of turnout we had for the BID . . . ”

   The process included a campaign organized by Venice Community Housing to convince property owners to vote against the BID in the balloting process.

---

10 Informal in the sense that there seem to be no fixed laws or policies describing the role of Council staff in the process.
11 See Council File 16-0749 for details.
12 Local newspaper for Venice and Marina del Rey.
14 A local housing rights organization.
15 For detailed evidence of these matters see the public comments in Council File 16-0749.
3  Tara Devine

3.1  Lobbying activities

13. The City Clerk’s BID Formation Guidelines (see Exhibit 1, page 22) describes the role of the BID Consultant in terms which make it very plausible that BID consultancy constitutes lobbying activities in the sense of LAMC 48.02:

Note that the main functions of a consultant are: to organize the proponent group and business community by using statistical, research and marketing techniques and strategies including focus groups, questionnaires, telephone surveys and community information meetings; to quantify, prioritize, prepare and present a documented array of services, activities, programs and improvements including a range of associated costs; to construct a membership database of the proposed BID members; to design an appropriate assessment formula; to identify key stakeholders and recommend individuals capable and willing to serve in an Advisory Board capacity; to develop a non-profit management entity as necessary to manage affairs of the established district including performing incorporation procedures as required; and, to package the project for delivery to the City Clerk’s Office.

14. Because the establishment of a BID is discretionary on the Council’s part even if all necessary requirements are met (paragraph 5 above), BID formation is not ministerial, and thus BID consultancy constitutes “attempting to influence” municipal legislation in the sense of LAMC 48.02.

3.1.1  Research, investigation, and information gathering

Petitions

15. Recall that in order for a BID to move forward, it is necessary for the Council to pass an OOI. In order for this to happen it is necessary to gather sufficiently many petitions from property owners (Paragraph 3). This process constitutes “attempting to influence” in the sense of LAMC 48.02 as it is gathering information which is necessary for the passage of an ordinance. Note, however, that it is also possible to view the petition-gathering process as “seeking to influence the position of a third party” since it’s often necessary for the consultant to convince property owners of the benefits of a BID before they’ll sign petitions. It’s clear from the City’s BID formation guidelines (Exhibit 1, page 22) that petition-gathering is “supporting …municipal legislation by [some] means”:

The consultant (or the proponent group), subsequent to achieving a basic consensus and support for the new BID, then performs the required field work and obtains supporting petitions from those who would pay the assessment …these petitions become part of the preliminary package.
16. In the next few paragraphs I give some specific examples of Tara Devine’s work with petitions, but there are many more described below in the Chronology (Section 3.2, page 11).

17. On June 15, 2016, Tara Devine communicated a number of times with NBID employees regarding petitions related to property in the proposed Venice Beach BID that was owned by the State of California. She stated her intention to discuss this matter with Debbie Dyner Harris:

I will touch base with Debbie to see if anything has transpired.

See Exhibit 19, page 67.

18. Also on June 15, 2016, Tara Devine communicated with NBID employees regarding petitions in general. She apprised them of the status of the petition drive and informed them of her plans to continue gathering petitions as part of the process of sending a complete OOI package to Council:

FYI to let you know where we are at, and update you regarding Metro as well (see my email to Mario below.) Yesterday’s Mario verified total was 27.9%. Today’s petitions appear complete, so I expect we will be at 28.41% once confirmed. We have almost 1.5% stuck in verification limbo. I am trying to resolve all of them. The largest (0.86%) is one that I believe Mario has moved up to you for a decision, Miranda. Snapshot LLC has a 65 year ground lease on a parcel owned by Ekker. Snapshot has signed their petition, but have preliminarily indicated that they will probably not provide a copy of their lease. They are checking with their attorneys; I have had radio silence from them for several days. I do not know why, but I get the sense that they are unwilling to make the lease contents public. Many companies are very protective of information they perceive as proprietary. Is there any alternate form of proof they can offer?

See Exhibit 20, page 70. Note that she is not only engaged in gathering petitions, but in working with City staff and acting as an intermediary between City staff and property owners to find ways to get valid petitions submitted in order to be able to submit the OOI package to Council.

19. On June 17, 2016 at 5:02 p.m. Tara Devine emailed City Clerk staff member Mario Montez about the status of the BID petitions, stating:

Today’s petitions three in one file
One petition/two parcels is the nowcomplete Sherman, Russell petition (previously incomplete/provisional)
Plus two more condos that appear fully complete to me.
If all three of these are valid, I have us at 51.67%. (1.26% provisional)
I have more I expect next week almost 4% at minimum (Metro, Thornton Venice, Tramco)
See Exhibit 24, page 80. Note that this shows that Tara Devine is not only engaged in collecting petitions to further the submission of the OOI to Council, but that she is reviewing them for validity and/or completeness, which seems to be “providing or using persuasion, information, statistics, analyses or studies” as well as “research, investigation and information gathering” in the sense of LAMC 48.02.

20. On June 17, 2016 at 6:29 p.m. Tara Devine emailed various City Clerk staff members about the status of her petition collecting efforts with some detail similar to that described in paragraph 19 above. See Exhibit 25, page 84.

21. On June 24, 2016 Tara Devine sent Mario Montez further documentation with respect to the Snapshot LLC parcel discussed above in paragraph 18. This initiated a month-long discussion between Devine, Miranda Paster, Montez, and Christy Numano-Hiura of the L.A. City Attorney’s office with respect to whether the documentation was sufficient to allow Snapshot LLC to sign the petitions and, as turned out to be the case, if it was not, what kind of documentation it would be necessary for Tara Devine to gather in order to allow the petition to be signed. The Clerk’s office advised Devine on this and Devine gathered the necessary documentation to allow the petition to be signed. See Exhibit 36 (page 115). Again, this demonstrates how the process of gathering and verifying petitions constitutes “attempting to influence” by means of “research, investigation, and information gathering.”

22. On June 24, 2016, Tara Devine participated in a lengthy exchange of emails with California Department of Parks and Recreation employee Craig Sap and a number of employees of the Clerk’s office about the ability of the City of Los Angeles to vote the ballots for the State’s park property in the proposed BID and subsequently to pay the assessments. See Exhibit 35, page 105.

BID Database

23. One of the tasks that must be completed by the BID consultant in order to move the OOI into Council is, according to City BID formation guidelines, “to construct a membership database of the proposed BID members” (see Paragraph 13 above). Garen Yegparian is the NBID staff member who handles these BID databases. The compilation of this database is therefore “supporting . . . municipal legislation by . . . providing . . . information [and] statistics” and therefore constitutes lobbying activity in the sense of LAMC 48.02. Multiple specific instances of Tara Devine’s compensated labor on the VBBID database are outlined below in the Chronology at Section 3.2 (page 11).

Management District Plan

24. As discussed above in paragraph 4, one of the BID consultant’s responsibilities is to prepare a Management District Plan for presentation to the City Council during the BID approval process. This is lobbying activity in the sense of research, investigation, and information gathering. In Los Angeles, this MDP is incorporated into the POA’s contract with the City to administer the BID, and thus controls the BID’s activities.
Since the City Council has the power to modify the MDP to any extent during the BID formation process (see paragraph 5 above), the preparation of a convincing MDP constitutes advocacy for the POA’s preferred set of activities (as opposed to any changes the Council might make before approval). It is standard for the Council to approve MDPs as presented, but the unique circumstances and unprecedented dispute over the approval of the VBBID (see paragraph 12 above) suggest that in this particular case, the careful preparation of the MDP constitutes “attempting to influence” municipal legislation in the sense of LAMC 48.02, even more so than it might under ordinary conditions. The specific timing of Tara Devine’s compensated labor on the VBBID MDP is discussed below in the Chronology at Section 3.2 (page 11).

### 3.1.2 Attending or monitoring City meetings, hearings, or other events

25. According to Tara Devine, she attended the Metro Board of Directors meeting on June 23 in order to monitor Metro’s authorizing ballots representing its property within the VBBID to be voted in favor of the BID. See Exhibit 33 (page 101).

26. Tara Devine attended the June 28, 2016 meeting of the Los Angeles City Council’s Economic Development Committee. She identified herself as a paid speaker speaking in favor of the VBBID on behalf of the VBPOA. See Exhibit 37 (page 122).

27. Tara Devine attended the August 23, 2016 meeting of the Los Angeles City Council. She identified herself as a paid speaker speaking in favor of the VBBID on behalf of the VBPOA. See Exhibit 44 (page 145).

### 3.1.3 Seeking to influence the position of a third party

28. On June 3, 2016 Rita Moreno sent Tara Devine a copy of a letter that Holly Wolcott had sent to disgruntled property owner Louis Traeger. I subsequently show that Devine was asked by the Clerk’s Office to communicate with other unhappy property owners, and the letter she sent them is very similar to this letter. Thus it seems plausible to count Devine’s receipt of this letter as part of her work seeking to influence the positions of third parties. See Exhibit 6 (page 36).

29. On July 27, 2016 Venice property owner William Kuel emailed Tara Devine, Holly Wolcott, and a number of other City Clerk staff about a letter he had sent to them on July 14 protesting the inclusion of his property in the proposed BID. In the July 14 letter he quoted extensively from a detailed exchange he had had with Tara Devine.

---

16It’s not clear to me whether the adjective “City” in LAMC 48.02’s definition of “lobbying activity” is meant to distribute over the terms “hearings” and “other events.” If so, Metro Board meetings may not be included, as Metro is a joint powers authority. However, this is probably “similar compensated conduct” as it is surely “related to a direct communication to influence any municipal legislation” in the sense that she was there making sure that Metro approved the voting of its property in favor of the BID, which was necessary for getting the OOI before the LA City Council. Tara Devine’s attendance at this meeting is also similar to attending or monitoring City meetings as CD11 Councilmember Mike Bonin sits on the Metro Board of Directors.

17See e.g. paragraph 29.
on this issue. See Exhibit 39 (page 126). Furthermore, Also on July 27, NBID staff member Rita Moreno sent Holly Wolcott’s response to William Kuel. The response directed Kuel to contact Tara Devine with further questions about the BID. See Exhibit 40 (page 129). Thus Devine’s involvement in the multi-week discussion with Kuel was with the cooperation of the Clerk’s office, further supporting the principle that Devine’s work in doing outreach to Kuel with respect to the establishment of the BID constituted lobbying activity.

30. On August 17, 2016, Melanie Camp, a reporter with local publication Yo! Venice, sent a list of questions about the Venice Beach BID to David Graham-Caso, Councilmember Mike Bonin’s communications director. Graham-Caso forwarded it to Debbie Dyner Harris with a note stating:

Can you please send this to the BID consultant to get her help with the answers?

On August 18, 2016, Tara Devine sent over a page of responses to Camp’s questions to Graham-Caso and Dyner Harris. See Exhibit 41 (page 133). Melanie Camp published an article about the BID on August 24, entitled Venice BID Approved. See Exhibit 45 (page 147). This article contained extensive quotes from Devine’s work, attributed to Mike Bonin. Here is one example out of many. Devine wrote:

State law says that public/government parcels are not exempt from assessments. Anyone assessed gets a vote, proportional to the size of the assessment.

Camp quoted Mike Bonin as saying:

State law says that public/government parcels are not exempt from assessments, and since anyone who will be assessed gets a vote, the City is allowed to vote based on the total value of the property it owns within the BID boundaries.

3.2 Chronology

3.2.1 June 1, 2016

31. On June 1, 2016 Tara Devine emailed a batch of BID petitions to Mario Montez (See Exhibit 2, page 27). These took some gathering and preparation in addition to the time it took to email them, and I argue above in Paragraph 15 that petition collection, processing, and submission constitutes lobbying activity. In the absence of other information I estimate that preparing and submitting a day’s petitions constitutes 0.2 hours of lobbying activity.

32. Also on June 1, 2016, Tara Devine emailed Rick Scott and Rosemary Hinkson of the Clerk’s office requesting a replacement petition for Daniel Taban. It is clear from the context of the email that she has also discussed this matter with Taban. Thus this
is lobbying activity both as information gathering and as seeking to influence a third party. See Exhibit 3 (page 29). It seems reasonable to estimate that the discussion with Taban and the sending of the email constitutes at least 0.2 hours of lobbying activity.

3.2.2 June 2, 2016

33. On June 2, 2016 at 9:42 a.m. Tara Devine emailed a batch of BID petitions of Mario Montez (See Exhibit 4, page 31). There was more discussion about these than usual on this day, but it was mostly incidental to the submission process, so I estimate only 0.2 hours of lobbying activity.

34. On June 2, 2016 at 8:56 p.m. Tara Devine emailed another petition to Mario Montez (see Exhibit 5, page 33), along with her estimated running petition total. I’m estimating 0.1 hours for the sending of this email.

3.2.3 June 3, 2016

35. On June 3, 2016 at 10:50 a.m. Mario Montez emailed Tara Devine alerting her to a discrepancy in their petition counts. She replied at 10:53 a.m. At 11:18 a.m. he sent her a spreadsheet containing his count for her to check. At 1:54 p.m. she replied with the results of her evidently detailed checking. See Exhibit 5 (page 33). On June 3, 2016 at 1:01 p.m. Tara Devine sent a previously rejected petition back to Mario Montez along with a discussion of work she had done to validate it at his behest. See Exhibit 8 (page 42). Finally, on June 3, 2016 at 12:02 p.m. Rita Moreno sent Tara Devine an email (discussed in detail above at paragraph 28) which had to do with Devine’s seeking to influence the position of a third party (see Exhibit 6, page 36). Over this almost three hour time span it seems reasonable to round down to 2.0 hours of lobbying activity, mostly because it includes lunchtime.

36. Furthermore, on June 3, 2016 at 12:54 p.m., Devine received an email from a property owner, Melisande Green, about a problematic petition, and forwarded it to Mario Montez at 3:07 p.m. The receipt is plausibly already included in the estimate in paragraph 35, but the reply at 3:07 is outside the span and worth another 0.1 hours.

3.2.4 June 7, 2016

37. On June 7, 2016 Tara Devine submitted a petition to Mario Montez along with detailed analysis. See Exhibit 9 (page 44). The analysis plausibly makes this worth 0.2 hours of lobbying activity.

3.2.5 June 8, 2016

38. On June 8, 2016 at 3:45 p.m Tara Devine sent Mario Montez two petitions along with a question. He replied at 4:19 p.m., and she replied at 4:22 p.m., promising to check a point he’d raised and to mark the petitions provisional. See Exhibit 10 (page 46). It
seems reasonable to count this as 0.5 hours of lobbying activity given the analysis she promised to do.

3.2.6 June 9, 2016

39. On June 9, 2016 Tara Devine sent some information about the BID database to Garen Yegparian for his review. See Exhibit 13 (page 55). She also submitted that day’s petitions to Mario Montez as usual. See Exhibit 11 (page 48). I am counting the mere sending of an email as 0.1 hours of lobbying activity, so there are 0.2 hours for June 9.

3.2.7 June 10, 2016

40. On June 10, 2016 Tara Devine sent the day’s petitions to Mario Montez. See Exhibit 14 (page 57). She also copied Rita Moreno and Rick Scott with some information about the BID database. See Exhibit 15 (page 59). This is a total of 0.2 hours of lobbying activity.

3.2.8 June 13, 2016

41. On June 13, 2016 Garen Yegparian replied to Tara Devine’s email discussed above in Paragraph 39. I am counting the receipt of an information-heavy email\(^\text{18}\) as 0.1 hours of lobbying activity.

42. On June 13, 2016 at 12:44 p.m. Tara Devine sent the day’s petitions to Mario Montez. At 1:33 p.m. he responded by noting some problems with the petitions. At 1:43 p.m. she answered his concerns. It seems reasonable to count the first email as 0.1 hours and the second exchange as 0.2 hours for a total of 0.3 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 17 (page 63).

3.2.9 June 14, 2016

43. On June 14, 2016 Tara Devine sent Mario Montez two more petitions, one which had previously been rejected and was now being resubmitted with revisions. She also explained how she’d tracked down the source of some discrepancies between the two databases (hers and the City’s) and through a detailed analysis of the spreadsheet and a change to the spreadsheet code she had eliminated those errors in the future. See Exhibit 18 (page 65). From the detail involved it seems plausible to count this as 0.5 hours of lobbying activity.

3.2.10 June 15, 2016

44. On June 15, 2016 Tara Devine emailed various staffers in the City Clerk’s office about the initial BID petitions (see paragraphs 17 and 18 above, as well as Exhibit 22 on page 75). She sent emails at 11:00 a.m., 11:06 a.m., 11:11 a.m., 11:14 a.m., 12:30 p.m., 4:06 p.m., 4:30 p.m., and 4:53 p.m. Given that in these emails she describes her

\(^{18}\) As opposed to a mere polite responses, confirmations, and so on.
petition-gathering work,\textsuperscript{19} in which she was plausibly engaged in between the sending of these emails, it seems reasonable to count this as 1.5 hours between 11:00 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. and 1 hour between 4:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. for a total of 2.5 hours of lobbying activity on June 15, 2016.

45. On June 15, 2016, in the course of organizing a telephone call with Garen Yegparian to discuss some issues regarding BID petitions, Tara Devine stated that she was not available from 1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. because “I may need to be at Metro.” I have no evidence that shows whether or not she did go to Metro, but reserving time away from compensated activities must also be compensated, so this plausibly adds 1.5 hours of lobbying activity on June 15, 2016.

46. Also on June 15, 2016 Tara Devine emailed the day’s petitions to Mario Montez at 4:22 p.m. and mentions that the Metro committee she had been monitoring (see paragraph 45 above) had voted in favor of the BID. There’s no time here that wasn’t already counted in the above paragraphs, but this email confirms that she was engaged in lobbying activity by monitoring the Metro committee meeting. See Exhibit 21 (page 73).

\textbf{3.2.11 June 17, 2016}

47. On June 17, 2016 Tara Devine emailed various staff members in the City Clerk’s office about the initial BID petitions (see paragraphs 19 and 20 above). She sent emails at 5:02 p.m., 5:11 p.m., and 6:29 p.m. describing her petition collection, review, and validation efforts. Her 5:02 email (Exhibit 24, page 80) seems to imply that she had engaged in petition review before sending, as does her 6:29 p.m. email (Exhibit 25, page 84). It seems reasonable then to assume 0.5 hours for reviewing petitions prior to sending the 5:02 email and that the entire 1.5 hours between 5:02 and 6:29 were spent either reviewing petitions or preparing and sending emails to City staff. This makes approximately 2 hours of lobbying activity on June 17, 2016.

\textbf{3.2.12 June 20, 2016}

48. On June 20, 2016 at 12:40 p.m. Tara Devine wrote to a number of people in the Clerk’s office trying to hurry the database approval process. See Exhibit 28 (page 90). On June 20, 2016, at 11:04 p.m. Tara Devine sent Garen Yegparian a revised version of the BID database, incorporating changes that he had suggested. She also mentioned that they had had a phone conversation about some database entries. I have no evidence for the length of the phone conversation. See Exhibit 26 (page 86). This is a span of more than 11 hours, during which Tara Devine consulted with Garen Yegparian and revised the database. It’s not possible to be sure how much of this period constituted lobbying activity, but it given the complexity of the database and the late hours Devine is claiming, it does not seem unreasonable to assume that she spent at least 4 of the 11 hours working on the database. Along with the emails and the phone call it seems reasonable to estimate 4.3 hours of lobbying activity on June 20, 2016.

\textsuperscript{19} Argued above in paragraph 15 to be lobbying activity.
49. On June 20, 2016 exchanged emails with Mario Montez about petitions, comparing the running totals and discussing the statuses of various parcels. I’m counting this as 0.2 hours. See Exhibit 27 (page 88).

3.2.13 June 21, 2016

50. On June 21, 2016 at 11:34 a.m. Tara Devine and Garen Yegparian exchanged emails about checking entries in the BID database in response to discussions they’d have about specific parcels (See Exhibit 29, page 92). At 2:42 p.m. Tara Devine emailed Garen Yegparian about more parcel checking, referring to a voicemail he’d left her about the database (see Exhibit 30, page 95). Three emails, a voicemail, some parcel checking, and a phone conversation is plausibly 0.5 hours of lobbying activity for June 21, 2016.

3.2.14 June 22, 2016

51. On June 22, 2016 at 7:38 a.m. Tara Devine emailed various people at the Clerk’s office notifying them that the database spreadsheet had stopped working and that this was holding up their revisions of the MDP and the ER. At 9:07 a.m. BID Analyst Dennis Rader notified Devine that he had found the problem. Devine emailed back thanking him and stating that the problem had caused her to beat her head “against the proverbial wall for a while.” It is not possible to be sure how much time was involved in this episode, but it seems fair to say that the email exchange, the identification of the problem, the adoption of the solution propounded by Rader, and the head-against-the-proverbial-wall-beating constituted at least 1.0 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 31 (page 97).

52. On June 22, 2016 at 4:45 p.m. Tara Devine submitted revised versions of the MDP and the Engineer’s Report to the Clerk’s office. At 5:23 p.m. Rita Moreno pointed out some errors, and at 5:39 p.m. Tara Devine submitted another revision. See Exhibit 32 (page 99). Furthermore, Devine stated in an email from June 15, 2016 that with respect to the MDP, “I can turnaround my changes in 1-2 days once I have final dbase.” See Exhibit 23 (page 78). Given that Dennis Rader fixed the database problems at 9:07 a.m. (paragraph 51) and Devine estimated that it would take her one to two days to revise, it does not seem unreasonable to take her at her word for the low end of her estimate and count this as 8.0 hours of lobbying activity.

3.2.15 June 23, 2016

53. According to Tara Devine, she attended the Metro Board of Directors meeting on June 23, 2016 “from approx. 8:30 until whenever our item is heard (VB petition)” (see Exhibit 33, page 101). The Venice Beach BID matter was item number 42 on the agenda (see Exhibit 34, page 103). An audio recording of the meeting is available: Metro Board of Directors June 23, 2016 meeting, which proves that Item 42 was considered at 4:13:05 along with a number of other consent calendar items. This
rounds down to approximately 4 hours of lobbying activity as described in Paragraph 25.

3.2.16 June 24, 2016

54. At 8:54 a.m. on June 24, Tara Devine emailed Miranda Paster, Debbie Dyner Harris, and Craig Sap of the California Department of Parks and Recreation to arrange a conference call to discuss petitions. The discussion, which apparently included a conference call as well as many emails, continued until 12:38 p.m. This rounds down to approximately 2.5 hours of lobbying activity. See paragraph 22 above as well as Exhibit 35, page 105.

55. At 3:33 p.m. on June 24, Tara Devine sent additional documentation regarding petition from Snapshot LLC (see paragraphs 18 and 21 above for more detail). In the email she discusses work she’s done to gather the documentation and also mentions that she has restructured the PDF containing the new information to save Mario Montez time in the verification process. This is more than an ordinary petition submission, so I am counting it as 0.3 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 36 (page 115, page 1/6 in the internal document numbering).

3.2.17 June 28, 2016

56. According to the City’s Audio of the June 28, 2016 meeting of the Economic Development Committee, the meeting lasted slightly more than 56 minutes. This rounds up to 1 hour of lobbying activity as described in Paragraph 26.

3.2.18 June 29, 2016

57. On June 29, 2016 Tara Devine emailed Mario Montez to check on the status of the petition revised documentation for which she had submitted on June 24. This petition is discussed in more detail in paragraphs 18 and 21 above. I’m estimating this simple email as 0.1 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 36 (page 115, pages 2/6 and 3/6 in the internal document numbering).

3.2.19 July 11, 2016

58. On July 11, 2016 Tara Devine emailed Mario Montez to check again on the status of the Snapshot LLC petition, revised documentation for which she had submitted on June 24. She also submitted new documentation on this troublesome petition along with some new and newly revised petitions. She also mentions a large block of unsubmitted petitions that she has “been having trouble getting the documentation” for. This email plausibly describes at least 0.5 hours of lobbying activity. The Snapshot LLC petition is discussed in more detail in paragraphs 18 and 21 above. See Exhibit 36 (page 115, pages 3/6 and 4/6 in the internal document numbering).
3.2.20  July 18, 2016

59. On July 18, Tara Devine and Miranda Paster exchanged emails about the troublesome Snapshot LLC petition (see paragraphs 18 and 21 above for more detail). Tara Devine mentioned more documentation she had collected with respect to this petition. The email exchange and the collection of additional information make an estimate of 0.3 hours of lobbying activity plausible. See Exhibit 36 (page 115, page 4/6 in the internal document numbering).

60. In mid-July 2016 CD11 constituent Jed Pauker emailed Venice field deputy Taylor Bazely asking for a copy of the BID map. This email was answered by CD11 staffer Debbie Dyner Harris, who CC-ed Tara Devine, stating that she might be able to help him. On July 18, 2016 Tara Devine sent Pauker a copy of the map. This constitutes lobbying activity in the sense of seeking to influence the position of a third party, and is worth probably 0.1 hours of compensated work. See Exhibit 38 (page 124).

3.2.21  July 24, 2016

61. On July 24, 2016 Tara Devine emailed Rick Scott of NBID with a question on behalf of her clients regarding something called the BID Trust Fund.\(^{20}\) He responded on July 27. This exchange is plausibly 0.1 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 42 (page 138).

3.2.22  July 27, 2016

62. On July 27, 2016 Tara Devine was CC-ed in an email exchange between NBID and Venice property owner William Kuel. This exchange, and the fact that it constitutes lobbying activity, is discussed above in paragraph 29. In his email Kuel quotes extensively from a detailed discussion he’d had with Devine over the inclusion of his property in the BID. The date of that discussion is not clear,\(^{21}\) so I’m counting it here. The July 27 exchange is worth 0.1 hours of lobbying activity, since Devine apparently did nothing more than receive some emails. The discussion quoted in Kuel’s letter is plausibly worth 0.5 hours, given the level of detail. See Exhibits 39 and 40 (pages 126 and 129 respectively).

3.2.23  August 9, 2016

63. On August 9, 2016 Tara Devine sent a lengthy email to Venice property owner William Kuel discussing his further concerns about the inclusion of his property in the BID (see paragraph 29 above for more background on this). The sheer length and level of detail of this email makes it plausible that it’s worth 0.5 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 43 (page 140).

\(^{20}\)I am not sure what this is.

\(^{21}\)It must have occurred sometime prior to July 15, 2016.
3.2.24 August 12, 2016

64. On August 12, 2016 Tara Devine sent yet another email, this one fairly brief, advising William Kuel with respect to his property. This is plausibly worth 0.2 hours of lobbying activity. See Exhibit 43 (page 140).

3.2.25 August 17-18, 2016

65. On these two days Tara Devine worked with CD11 staffers David Graham-Caso and Debbie Dyner Harris to write more than a page of responses to questions from reporter Melanie Camp (see Paragraph 30 above). It’s plausible that the discussion and the actual writing constituted at least 1 hour of lobbying activity.

3.2.26 August 23, 2016

66. According to the City’s Video of the August 23, 2016 City Council meeting, the VBBID hearing commenced at 1:52:00 and lasted essentially until the end of the meeting 50 minutes later. Tara Devine was present from the beginning of the meeting.\footnote{I saw her there myself in this instance.} This rounds down to about 2.5 hours of lobbying activity as described in Paragraph 27.
### 3.2.27 Tabular summary of chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.2.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.2.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2.12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.2.13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2.17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2.18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.2.17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2.18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2.17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2.18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2.23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2.24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2.23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2.24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Financial analogy with South Park BID Consultancy

67. The South Park Business Improvement District (“SPBID”) in Downtown Los Angeles was up for renewal in 2015. Council actions on this matter are contained in Council File 12-1168. From a legal standpoint there is no distinction between the process of BID
renewal and the process of BID establishment. Tara Devine acted as BID consultant in this matter as well.

68. The final ordinance establishing the SPBID came before the City Council on July 1, 2015. As shown above, the final ordinance establishing the VBBID came before the City Council on August 23, 2016. Thus it seems reasonable to compare Tara Devine’s work on the SPBID during April, May, and June 2015 to her work on the VBBID during June, July, and August 2016. In fact, due to the contentious nature of the VBBID, it is extremely unlikely that Tara Devine spent less time on it in the three months prior to the final Council action than she did on the utterly routine matter of the SPBID in the corresponding three months.

69. While I have not yet been able to collect evidence showing how much time Tara Devine spent preparing the SPBID renewal for Council action, I have obtained a record of SPBID payments to her over the relevant time-span. This record constitutes Exhibit 46 (page 150). It’s not possible to tell precisely when the services being paid for were performed, but the list shows payments on April 15, 2015, May 13, 2015, and June 19, 2015 of $4,875, $11,250, and $4,875 respectively, for a total of $21,000 paid to Tara Devine during the relevant three months.

3.4 Conclusion

70. I have argued above that Tara Devine was compensated for more than 30 hours in the three consecutive months beginning in June 2016 for attempting to influence City action on the establishment of the Venice Beach BID, which was accomplished via municipal legislation. Her lobbying activity included multiple contacts with City officials and employees both in the City Clerk’s office and in Council District 11. Thus Tara Devine was acting as a lobbyist within the meaning of LAMC 48.02.

71. Additionally, it’s likely (see Section 3.3, page 19) that Tara Devine was paid at least $21,000 over the course of these three months for her work attempting to influence City action. This lends support to the proposition that she was compensated for at least 30 hours of lobbying activity during this time.

72. Tara Devine is not exempted from the requirements of the Municipal Lobbying Ordinance by any of the exemptions enumerated in LAMC 48.03.

73. Therefore Tara Devine was required by LAMC 48.07(A) to register with the City as a lobbyist. A search of registrations from 2016 indicates that she did not do so and was therefore in violation of the Municipal Lobbying Ordinance.

---

23 The main difference between the two processes is that a BID can be renewed for up to 10 years but an initial establishment is limited to 5 years.
24 See paragraph 12 above.
25 I got this from SPBID staff member Katie Kiefer via the California Public Records Act.
26 In Section 3.1.
4 Requested action

74. I ask the City Ethics Commission to determine whether these facts constitute a violation of the Municipal Lobbying Ordinance of the part of Tara Devine and, if so, to see that she’s held responsible for her actions.

75. Tara Devine is far from the only person acting as a BID consultant in the City, and there’s nothing particularly unique to her about the set of facts on which I’ve based this report. She’s guilty of violating the MLO if and only if a number of other people are also guilty. It would save everyone concerned a great deal of grief if the question of whether BID consultants are required to register as lobbyists were settled in general, rather than requiring a chain of lengthy and complicated individual investigations. I therefore also request that the City Ethics Commission exercise its authority under §702(e) of the City Charter

   to provide assistance to agencies and public officials in administering the provisions of the Charter and other laws relating to campaign finance, conflicts of interest and governmental ethics

by either

(1) issuing a public opinion on the general question of whether BID consultants must register as lobbyists, or, if that’s not properly within the purview of the CEC, then

(2) by requesting that the City Attorney issue such an opinion under the authority granted to his office by §271(b) of the City Charter.27

---

27It’s hard to tell from the text of that section whether or not it refers only to the issuance of private opinions within the attorney/client relationship between the City Attorney and the City. However, deputy City Attorney Mike Dundas assures me that the City Attorney does occasionally issue public opinions interpreting the law, much as does the state Attorney General. Clearly a public statement on this matter would best serve everyone concerned.
5 Exhibits

5.1 Exhibit 1 – City BID formation guidelines
The Citywide Business Improvement District (BID) Program, as developed by the City of Los Angeles and pursuant to all pertinent state legislation, may be divided into three basic stages: Stage One, which consists of necessary tasks and activities is referred to as the Formation Stage; Stage Two, which consists of the required meetings, hearings and support tabulation is referred to as the Establishment Stage; and Stage Three, which consists of contractual, organizational and programming activities is referred to as the Operational or Administrative Stage. This document will serve to summarize each of the three stages. The Administrative Services Division of the Office of the City Clerk is preparing a more comprehensive guide to the investigative, legislative and administrative processes involved in formation, establishment and administration.

STAGE ONE: FORMATION

The preliminary procedures for business improvement district formation are described below. Certain procedures are applicable in all situations and certain elements are common to all business communities. However, it is important to keep in mind the fact that each and every proposed district possesses unique characteristics. This is where customizing the project becomes necessary and, historically, this is also when a consultant is hired to package the project. The following information should be considered as a summary.

1. An individual, or a group of individuals ("proponent group"), or a Councilmember, desires to investigate the possibility of establishing a BID in a given area. A Motion is prepared, presented and adopted which directs the City Clerk's Office to work with the proponent group. City Clerk staff contacts the group. City Clerk staff supplies reports, data, videotapes and other information to the group in order to educate them and to ascertain if a BID is the correct vehicle for the situation. City Clerk staff assistance is also provided in the form of presentations and on-site meetings. If a BID is determined to be appropriate, the process continues.
2. The available finances to fund the preliminary stages of BID formation are explored. If the proponent group is undercapitalized, City funding may be requested and the process as outlined in the City's BID Policy document is generally followed. If the proponent group possesses sufficient capital, a consultant may be hired directly by the proponent group. Alternately, costs may be shared between the City and the proponent group.

Note that the main functions of a consultant are: to organize the proponent group and business community by using statistical, research and marketing techniques and strategies including focus groups, questionnaires, telephone surveys and community information meetings; to quantify, prioritize, prepare and present a documented array of services, activities, programs and improvements including a range of associated costs; to construct a membership database of the proposed BID members; to design an appropriate assessment formula; to identify key stakeholders and recommend individuals capable and willing to serve in an Advisory Board capacity; to develop a nonprofit management entity as necessary to manage affairs of the established district including performing incorporation procedures as required; and, to package the project for delivery to the City Clerk's Office. In addition, many community organizations find it prudent to retain professional services after the BID is established in order to guide the fledgling district and service provider through its initial operating stages.

If the proponent group is undercapitalized but does not wish to receive support funding, it is of course possible to form a district without a hired consultant. In this situation, the group must perform the focus group interviews, the telephone and mail surveys, the prioritizing of proposed BID projects, the cost estimates, the RFP process for security and maintenance cost identification, the database development and the budget construction. In order to successfully complete these steps without a consultant, the group should be well-organized and at some stage of consensus regarding the overall project objectives. The group will receive
guidance from staff in each of these areas. In this scenario, City Clerk staff members may serve informally as the consultant and assist with the tasks as outlined.

The consultant (or the proponent group), subsequent to achieving a basic consensus and support for the new BID, then performs the required field work and obtains supporting petitions from those who would pay the assessment: at least 15% of the business owners or more than 50% of the property owners must sign supporting petitions; these petitions become part of the preliminary package.

3. The proposed package is presented to the City Clerk's Office for plan evaluation and technical review. The work program, the schedule of activities, the ratio of expenses to service activities allocations, the budget, and the assessment methodology are reviewed in the Special Assessments Unit. Verification of petitions is also performed at this time. Legal issues are discussed with the City Attorney. Normally, certain programs, activities, budget elements and the contents of the management plan are negotiated and modified during this review. After the review is completed and the package is recommended for approval, City Clerk staff prepare a report which summarizes key points and outlines the procedural steps required to consider establishment. City Clerk staff members finalize information within the district database and prepare the required attachments which, in conjunction with the Department's report, introduce the proposed project to the City Council and related Committees. The legislative hearing process is then scheduled and initiated.

STAGE TWO: ESTABLISHMENT

The procedures and activities related to establishment of a BID are largely legislative in nature. Numerous types of statutory deadlines and City requirements must be adhered to. During the public hearing process, the proponent group continues to maintain the momentum which resulted in the completion of Stage One. Key stakeholders are frequently canvassing the businesses or property owners in the proposed BID to ensure a positive response to the City Council hearings and, if applicable, a return of the ballots which are required for property based districts.
STAGE THREE: ADMINISTRATION

After the City Council establishes a BID, an administration agreement, entered into between the City and the BID’s operating entity (owners’ association), must be entered into in order for the owners’ association to administer and implement the services and activities of the BID.
5.2 Exhibit 2 – June 1 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today’s petitions (7 in one file - please note, one of them is another of those four parcels for which ownership name was blank when we last pulled data. But at least you know we mailed petitions to absolutely everyone - this is the second one of them that we have received back. :)

Arnoldi Bill Hertz Chevalier.pdf
7525K.
5.3 Exhibit 3 – June 1 2016 Devine to Clerk’s Office requesting replacement ballot
Ballot replacement request

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>
Cc: Daniel Taban <daniel@jadeent.com>

Mon, Jun 1, 2015 at 12:08 PM

Dear Rosemary/Rick:

Daniel Taban and his family own several properties in the SPII BID. They have not received a ballot for one of their properties and would like to request a replacement. I believe it is APN# 5139011001 (209 W 11th St.) He is cc'd above.

Could you or the appropriate Clerk staff kindly send Daniel the form required to request a replacement? Thank you!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts
5.4 Exhibit 4 – June 2 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/2/16

4 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 9:42 AM

Today's petitions, 2 in one file (I rec'd two others but both of those were incomplete so I'm kicking them back for re-execution/completion.)

When you get a chance, can you let me know what % you have received for Venice so I can cross-check it with my tally? Thanks!

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 9:50 AM

Tara,

No attached petitions here? For today received one batch of seven - first page Arnoldi, last page Chevalier.

Thanks

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 10:22 AM

Sorry about that. Re-sending.

I actually just rec'd a 3rd a few minutes ago, so now there are 3 petitions attached (these are in addition to the 7 sent yesterday.)

SUTTER BENDERSON.pdf

3333K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 2:24 PM

Tara,

Regarding the last batch of petitions, a couple of problem petitions listed below.

Windward Avenue Associates - ownership matches County records - however need petition signer Gerard Bill relationship i.e. manager, member etc.

BOJO LLC (4226-007-009) - situs 57 Market St - petition signed by David Heitz as owner. County records show owner as BOJO LLC. Need petition signer's relationship to BOJO LLC.

Thanks
Maro

[Quoted text hidden]
5.5 Exhibit 5 – June 2-3 2016 Devine/Montez emails discussing database discrepancies
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/3/16
6 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
Thu, Jun 2, 2016 at 8:56 PM

Today’s petition - just one condo, but fully executed/complete :)

I am following up to get the information you requested on Bill Gerard and David Heitz petitions.
I will forward as soon as I hear back. I am still working on the other rejected ones. For a few for whom we don't have contact info other than mailing address, I've already mailed them back with a note. For another, I'm awaiting their documentation from their attorney (Scharff owner change.)

I show us at 25.63% currently (with an additional 0.80% rejected and awaiting more information, re-executing, supporting documentation, etc.)
Please let me know if that matches what you have or not. Thanks, and have a great weekend!

KAPADIA.pdf
1276K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 10:50 AM

Tara,

Petition count I have is %25.05 not including the problem petitions.

Thanks
Mario

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 10:53 AM

Interesting.

I can send you an Excel list of the ones I have received and believe were submitted/accepted, with the ones in limbo shown separately.

Or if it’s less work for you, please send me your list and I can check to see if any are missing and resubmit those.

Whatever is less difficult for you, I am happy to do. Thanks!

[Quoted text hidden]

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 11:18 AM

Here’s my petition count database updated to include today’s condo petition 25.07%.

[Quoted text hidden]
Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 1:54 PM

Thank you very much for sharing. I compared with mine and here's where our discrepancies exist:

I submitted two petitions that you did not record (and I do not find a record of you kicking them back after a quick search of my emails.) If they were rejected, please remind me why so I can address it. Jose Bunge signed for three petitions, but only one is recorded as a “Y” in your spreadsheet. APN 4226010012 is marked Y. Adjacent APNs -013 (0.11%) and -014 (0.33%) are not marked Y, but you did add a note to the comments column.

On my end, I have about a dozen parcels where the % is one-tenth higher, and one large parcel which is two-tenths higher. So that explains the rest of our differing percentage on the total. I presume it’s a rounding issue difference in our spreadsheets, and I'm not really worried about it. (We’ll want to exceed our threshold by more than this difference anyway.)

Otherwise, we're identical. Thanks for furnishing your list. Please let me know if there's any problem with the other two Bunge petitions. Thanks!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE  
DEVINE STRATEGIES  
645 West Ninth St, #110-293  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
310.430.5121  
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES  
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

---

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 2:10 PM

Tara,

Those two parcels 4226010013 & 014 should be marked “yes”, my updated number is 26.05%.

---
5.6 Exhibit 6 – June 3 2016 Rita Moreno to Tara Devine re Louis Traeger letter
Hi Tara,

It was nice meeting you yesterday. Per your request, attached is the City Clerk's response to the letter received by Mr. Louis V. Traeger protesting the inclusion of his property in the proposed Venice Beach BID.

Note we are also sending a copy to the Engineer, Ed Henning.

Thank you and let me know if you have any questions.

Rita

--
Rita Moreno
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
200 N. Spring Street, 2nd Floor #237
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Office (213) 978-1122
Fax (213) 978-1130

Letter to Louis V. Traeger.pdf
573K
June 1, 2016

Louis V. Traeger

Dear Mr. Traeger:

The Office of the City Clerk is in receipt of your letter, dated May 19, 2016, regarding your property located at 207 E. Horizon Avenue, Venice, CA 90291 and the petition to establish the Venice Beach Business Improvement District. We have noted your opposition to being included in the proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District the property (Assessor's ID No. 4238 010 016) is a residence and has been used as such continuously since its building in 1923. In addition, it is located in the Venice Historical District (ZI) No. 2453.

The Office of the City Clerk, Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division (formerly Administrative Services Division, Special Assessment Section) has confirmed that 207 E. Horizon Avenue, Venice, CA 90291 is a single family home and a contributing structure within the Lost Venice Canals Historic District. It is zoned C1-1-0 which allows for limited commercial use (LAMC Chapter 1 Article 2 § 12.13), as well as assessment if an Engineer determines it will specially benefit.

In address of your request to remove said property from the proposed Business Improvement District, the City Clerk does not have the authority to remove or add any properties in a Business Improvement District. However, we will forward your request and this information to the Engineer conducting the survey and analysis for the creation of the Venice Beach Business Improvement District.

Further, you requested notice of any hearing concerning the approval of the Venice Beach Business Improvement District in order to submit your written opposition. If your property is ultimately included within the Business Improvement District boundaries, a notice of the City Council hearing date will be mailed to you. At the hearing, an opportunity will be provided to protest the establishment.
If you have questions related to this letter, please contact Rita Moreno at (213) 978-1122 or via email: rita.moreno@lacity.org. Any questions about the proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District should be directed to Tara Devine at tara@devine-strategies.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Holly L. Wolcott
City Clerk

cc:   Ed Henning, Certified Engineer

HLW:MP:rm
5.7 Exhibit 7 – June 3 2016 Devine to Montez re Hertz/Bojo petitions
Venice Beach BID petition: Hertz / BOJO LLC (follow up)

2 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 3:07 PM

Here is the supplemental information you requested for APN 4226007009. Please let me know if this is sufficient.

Thanks!

On Jun 3, 2016, at 12:54 PM, Melisande Green <melisande@studioea.com> wrote:

Per the Bojo organizational docs, you are the manager of Bojo, LLC.

MELISANDE GREEN
DAVID HERTZ ARCHITECT, INC.
Studio of Environmental Architecture
57 Market St., Venice, CA 90291
310.829.9932 x204
www.studioea.com

On Jun 3, 2016, at 7:58 AM, David Hertz <hertz@studioea.com> wrote:

Melisande,

I forgot the exact title for my position at BOJO LLC. Can you look at the documents and let me know?

Thanks

Studio of Environmental Architecture

57 Market St.
Venice, Ca 90291
310-829-9932
Studioea.com

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 3:14 PM

Yes - petition now validated.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=c3b7d10086&view=pt&q=tara%40devine-strategies.com&es=true&search=query&th=155184f5e3e3f2d&siml=1551...
5.8 Exhibit 8 – June 3 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Supporting documentation for kicked-back petition

2 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 1:01 PM

Mario:

The first attachment is a petition you previously kicked back (one of several executed by Ann Everest.) One petition/three parcels. Ann edited the ownership name when she executed it, and I believe you did not find the new name in the County records.

She has provided me with the documentation showing that the ownership has changed (please see 2nd attachment.) Please confirm if this suffices and the petition is now validated. Thank you!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

2 attachments

Pages from EVEREST.pdf
207K

EVEREST - supporting documentation for 3 parcels with owner change.pdf
390K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Fri, Jun 3, 2016 at 1:16 PM

Tara,

Yes - petition in question is now validated.

[Quoted text hidden]
5.9 Exhibit 9 – June 7 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/7/16

2 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Tue, Jun 7, 2016 at 8:16 PM
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today's petition is from Louie Ryan. He listed himself on petition as manager, but he is also one of the owners. This petition is listed in your tally as BENNETT FAMILY LLC.

Louie says they bought the property in 2015 and this is the new entity (52 WINDWARD LLC) that currently owns the property. If County records do not match and you need the deed, please let me know. I will mark it as provisional until you let me know it's been accepted.

52 WINDWARD - replaces BENNETT.pdf
229K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  Wed, Jun 8, 2016 at 3:52 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tara,

52 Windward petition is okay to count - County records show them as new owner.

[Quoted text hidden]
5.10 Exhibit 10 – June 8 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/8/16
3 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
Wed, Jun 8, 2016 at 3:45 PM

Today's petitions - two in one file
One is missing information in the "Title" field but is otherwise complete. It is a Trust that is signed by a Trustee. Let me know if this has to be re-executed or not - thanks!

---

BEILENSON SLENZAK.pdf  
2674K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Wed, Jun 8, 2016 at 4:19 PM

Tara,

Slenzak petition does need title field completed. Regarding the Beilenson petition - County records show the owner as Venice Beach Seaside Rentals LLC acquired 2/26/15.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
Wed, Jun 8, 2016 at 4:22 PM

LOL. Buggers. Don't think I have contact info for them except mail - will check. Will mark both provisional.

[Quoted text hidden]
5.11  Exhibit 11 – June 9 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/9/16

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 4:51 PM

Today's petitions - two in one file

JSB.pdf
2745K
5.12 Exhibit 12 – June 9-23 2016 emails Devine/Clerk Venice Beach BID: Update
Venice Beach BID: update
11 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:03 PM
To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Dear All:

While nothing is guaranteed, I have very strong reason to believe that we will clear petition (minus the not-yet-executed City petitions) very soon. Due to commitments (just the ones I find highly credible) and signatures in process now, I think there is a 90% chance that we will clear it sometime between this Friday 6/11 and next Friday 6/17.

We would really love to see the Ordinance of Intention (OOI) completed before Council's summer recess if at all possible. I believe their last meeting prior to recess will be on July 1 (and we may need to go to ED Committee first.)

Looking ahead, to keep that possibility viable, I would like to request your assistance with two items now:
- that the City begin preparing its petitions for signature
- we previously sent a revised database (version dated 2016.05.24) and a written explanation of some corrections discovered/made during the petition stage (subdivided parcels/replaced APNs etc.); overall, they result in a very small decrease in the budget (less than $8K.) If the 5/24 database can be verified/okayed by the Clerk fairly soon, it will allow us to edit the MDP and ER and be ready promptly with the updated versions for the OOI. We have found no other changes since 5/24/16.

FYI -- I also believe that Venice will end up exceeding 50%+$1 by a healthy margin. We will continue to accrue a lot more petitions over the next several weeks. We have many conversations in progress that are gradually bearing fruit, and we are also scheduled for Metro at the end of the month.

Miranda/Rita - when the petition threshold is certain, I will reach back out to you regarding OOI scheduling/coordination. If there is anything you wish me to do now to prep for it other than the MDP/ER revisions, just let me know.

Thank you all for the hard work you do that allows us to do the rest!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St. #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org> Fri, Jun 10, 2016 at 12:49 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Hi Tara,

I did not receive the revised database, though I'm sure Dennis and his team are working on it. Can you forward the email to me for reference? Rick is helping so we hope to get everything ready for Council soon.

Thanks.
Rita

[Quoted text hidden]

--
Rita Moreno
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
200 N. Spring Street, 2nd Floor #237
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Office (213) 978-1122
Fax (213) 978-1130

**Tara Devine** <tara@devine-strategies.com> Fri, Jun 10, 2016 at 1:02 PM
To: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>
Cc: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Yes, thank you both very much! I will forward the database to you and to Rick.

[Quoted text hidden]

**Miranda Paster** <miranda.paster@lacity.org> Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 10:16 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Hello.

Sounds like its working well. The consultant is responsible for submitting the petitions for City parcels to us for signature. Have you submitted them to us? We will forward them to Executive Management for signature.

After the petition level is reached the BID Analyst, Rita, will prepare the City Clerk report and Ordinance of Intention for City Atty signature. After City Atty and City Clerk signatures are obtained, the report will be placed in the Council file Management System and wait for the Economic Development Committee's consideration and then Council consideration.

Thank you.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:03 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

—

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

**Tara Devine** <tara@devine-strategies.com> Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 11:00 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

I will re-send the City petitions. City and state were previously emailed but perhaps not to all on this list.

Thanks!
Tara,

In the event we didn't point this out previously, there is an inconsistency with the assessment rate for building area. The Engineer's report erroneously states "$0.8 per square foot" rather than "$0.08 per square foot" in the first and second paragraphs of page 6 (v 1.3.2).

Thanks.

Rita

---

Rita Moreno  
City of Los Angeles  
Office of the City Clerk  
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division  
200 N. Spring Street, 2nd Floor #237  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Office (213) 978-1122  
Fax (213) 978-1130

We will add that to some assorted corrections I have from my last meeting with Rick & Miranda. Good catch - thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Rita Moreno  
City of Los Angeles  
Office of the City Clerk  
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division  
200 N. Spring Street, 2nd Floor #237  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Office (213) 978-1122  
Fax (213) 978-1130

One more under "District Boundary Description."

Page 8 of the Engineer's Report dated March 17, 2016 (v.1.3.2), near the top of the page and following the description related to APN 4238010009, states that there is an unnamed alley that runs immediately west of and parallel to Main Street. However, I believe the unnamed alley runs immediately east of and parallel to Main Street.

Please confirm and make any needed corrections.

Thanks.

Rita

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>  
Cc: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>  
Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 6:55 PM

TY, I will double-check this. There was one error like this in an earlier version that we corrected. There are so many unnamed alleys in this area - it was a really challenging boundary description to write!

[Quoted text hidden]
Rita - you were right on both of your edits. They have been corrected. We have made all the text edits in hopeful anticipation of finally resolving the database with Garen tomorrow. Once that happens, we can replace all of the charts and update many of the numbers that appear throughout the ER and MDP.

If all goes as agreed, I believe we can submit the revised MDP and ER sometime on Tuesday (as early as possible, although it could be after business hours depending on how soon we resolve the dbase.)

[Quoted text hidden]
5.13 Exhibit 13 – June 9, 2016 Tara Devine discussing database with Garen Yegparian
Revised Venice Beach BID database
1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:19 PM
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>

I know I sometimes struggle to keep track of these documents and versions, so just to make it easier, here is the most current version again. As you may recall, Tyler submitted a bunch on changes on 5/23, and I made one more the following day (5/24.)

Tyler's notes on his changes (5/23):

Attached please find an updated database for Venice Beach BID. The changes are reflected in the first tab labeled as VB Assessments-Updated, and the second tab labeled as VB Assessments-Original is there as a reference.

I made changes to the following APNs:

- 4286009091 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4286009092 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4286012041 - Split the APN to two (4286012044 & 4286012045) and deleted the 041 as County has updated the APN
- 4286028021 - Reduced bldg sf by 100, and reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028022 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028023 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028024 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028026 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028027 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028028 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028029 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028030 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028031 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg

The changes will decrease the total assessment by $4,904.61 which is approximately 0.26% change.

My notes on my change (5/24):

- 4286008001 - We have removed 187 from the F-commercial column (AS) as it is duplicative. The correct frontage of 186.82 remains in the F-residential column (AV.) The very first database was correct; we believe that somewhere during review/revisions that the frontage was accidentally added in again in the commercial column, resulting in a double charge for frontage. We reviewed other parcels looking for duplicate frontage; we found the error was isolated to this APN.

This results in that APN's assessment being reduced from $5859.49 to $3,150.60 and a corresponding reduction in the total budget.

Total change to APN's assessment: -$7,613.50

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts
5.14  Exhibit 14 – June 10, 2016 Petitions to Clerk’s Office
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/10/16 (Part II)

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>                    Fri, Jun 10, 2016 at 8:25 PM
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today's petitions (two attached in separate files, but the second one is incomplete - missing second signature - so I have marked it provisional and am kicking it back via mail with a request to complete.)

2 attachments

- BISHARA.pdf
  1286K

- SHERMAN - incomplete.pdf
  1361K
5.15  Exhibit 15 – June 10, 2016 Tara Devine discussing database with Rita Moreno and Rick Scott
Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Fwd: Revised Venice Beach BID database
4 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Fri, Jun 10, 2016 at 1:07 PM
To: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

This is the same as the last email; it's just a little easier to read/review the changes as they are consolidated. 
(P.S. Tyler is an analyst who does some of the work on my databases. I do some of the work as well.)

---------- Forwarded message --------
From: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Date: Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:19 PM
Subject: Revised Venice Beach BID database
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>

I know I sometimes struggle to keep track of these documents and versions, so just to make it easier, here is the most current version again. As you may recall, Tyler submitted a bunch on changes on 5/23, and I made one more the following day (5/24.)

Tyler's notes on his changes (5/23):

Attached please find an updated database for Venice Beach BID. The changes are reflected in the first tab labeled as VB Assessments-Updated, and the second tab labeled as VB Assessments-Original is there as a reference.

I made changes to the following APNs:

- 4286009091 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4286009092 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4286012041 - Split the APN to two (4286012044 & 4286012045) and deleted the 041 as County has updated the APN
- 4286028021 - Reduced bldg sf by 100, and reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028022 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028023 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028024 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028026 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028027 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028028 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028029 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028030 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028031 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg

The changes will decrease the total assessment by $4,904.61 which is approximately 0.26% change.

My notes on my change (5/24):

- 4286008001- We have removed 187 from the F-commercial column (AS) as it is duplicative. The correct frontage of 186.82 remains in the F-residential column (AV.) The very first database was correct; we believe that somewhere during review/revisions that the frontage was accidentally added in again in the commercial column, resulting in a double charge for frontage. We reviewed other parcels looking for duplicate frontage; we found the error was isolated to this APN.

This results in that APN's assessment being reduced from $5859.49 to $3,150.60 and a corresponding reduction in the total budget.

Total change to budget during petition stage: -$7,613.50

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
5.16 Exhibit 16 – June 13, 2016 Tara Devine discussing database with Garen Yegparian
Re: Revised Venice Beach BID database

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 4:41 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Hello Tara,

I've gone over the changes you addressed with the following results:

- 4266009091 - OK as modified
- 4266009092 - OK as modified
- 4266012041 - OK as modified
- 4266028021 - OK as modified
- 4266028022 - see below
- 4266028023 - see below
- 4266028024 - see below
- 4266028026 - see below
- 4266028027 - see below
- 4266028028 - see below
- 4266028029 - see below
- 4266028030 - see below
- 4266028031 - see below
- 4266008001 - OK as modified

For 4266028*** parcels, based on the fact that the two sets of APNs involved are in one building each, dividing up the frontage in the way you are proposing is not allowable. I looked in the assessment methodology, and did not see anything that specifically allows for this kind of allocation of frontage. If there is something I'm missing, please let me know, and this will be wrapped up quickly, since the arithmetic itself is correct.

Thank you for your patience, Tara.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:19 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I know I sometimes struggle to keep track of these documents and versions, so just to make it easier, here is the most current version again. As you may recall, Tyler submitted a bunch of changes on 5/23, and I made one more the following day (5/24.)

Tyler's notes on his changes (5/23):

Attached please find an updated database for Venice Beach BID. The changes are reflected in the first tab labeled as VB Assessments-Updated, and the second tab labeled as VB Assessments-Original is there as a reference.

I made changes to the following APNs:

- 4266009091 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4266009092 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4266012041 - Split the APN to two (4266012044 & 4266012045) and deleted the 041 as County has updated the APN
- 4266028021 - Reduced bldg sf by 100, and reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to commercial space in the same bldg
- 4266028022 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4266028023 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4266028024 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4266028026 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4266028027 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4266028028 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
5.17 Exhibit 17 – June 13, 2016 Devine/Montez discussion re petitions
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/13/16

6 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 12:44 PM

Today's petition - This is Snapshot aka Ekker, which I believe you will mark provisional. I have already followed up to request a copy of their lease and will forward when rec'd. Snapshot has a long-term ground lease (something like 65 years.)

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 1:33 PM

Tara,

Reviewed petitions received today - problem petitions listed below.

Sherman petition - Statement of Authority to Sign signature missing.

Snapshot petition - County shows owner as Ekker, Leslie Co Trs.

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 1:43 PM

No problem - I figured. I have marked both provisional for now. Former returned by mail with request to sign; on the latter, I have requested a copy of the lease. It apparently contains terms they do not wish to make public; they are checking with their attorneys, but are doubtful they will okay release of the lease.

Can they provide in lieu either of the following:

1) assignment of the lease
OR
2) excerpts and/or a redacted version that shows the following:
   - Term of the lease
   - The portion of the lease that says the tenant is responsible for all property taxes, etc.
   - Execution by lessor (owner of record) & lessee
3) Have the owner of record execute the petition (if she is willing to do so; we do not know if she is willing to.)
4) Some other form of documentation satisfactory to Clerk?

Lastly, I show us at 27.86% verified/official, with 1.52% provisional/rejected. Does this match your records?

[Quoted text hidden]
5.18 Exhibit 18 – June 14, 2016 Devine/Montez re petitions
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/14/16

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
Tue, Jun 14, 2016 at 12:48 PM

Today's petitions - two condos in one file
- One is Lanny Rudner, previously incomplete/provisional - now complete
- The other is Amy Ward - she submitted an incomplete petition (I never sent it to you; I just kicked it back) - FYI, that is
the reason for the (somewhat unusual) two different dates on her petition (she didn't complete all of the bottom box on
the first submission - I mailed it back to her about 10 days ago and she just returned it.)

P.S. FYI - I started working from your tally sheet (so we wouldn't have the rounding difference) and unless I somehow
edited it, I think your City total is off. On my copy it was not adding the correct parcels. It showed as
=SUM(BJ192:BJ214) but I believe it should be =SUM(BJ194:BJ216)+BJ96. (NOTE: BJ96 is a parcel listed under "City
of Los Angeles" whereas BJ194-BJ216 are those listed under "LA City." BJ96 gets easily overlooked with an
alphabetical by owner sort. The City total was about $33K less than it should be. With the correction, I now show the
City at $426,604.68 (22.92%) using your sheet (this matches our database - see public parcels tab.) The $ matches
exactly; the % is 22.97% in our database -- this is again is just due to the rounding difference.)

---

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Tue, Jun 14, 2016 at 1:10 PM

Tara,

I double checked and our City totals now match.

[Quoted text hidden]
5.19 Exhibit 19 – June 15 2016 Devine/Clerk emails City of Los Angeles Petitions
Fwd: CITY OF LOS ANGELES petitions (Venice)
4 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 11:06 AM
To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

> Forwarded message 
> From: "Tara Devine" <tara@devine-strategies.com>
> Date: May 5, 2016 12:24 PM
> Subject: CITY OF LOS ANGELES petitions (Venice)
> To: "Miranda Paster" <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, "Rick Scott" <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>
> Cc:

> Attached please find the City's petitions (5 in one file due to minor owner name variations, but all are City and not a specific department or proprietary) They total 22.98%. I am not sure how you wish to execute given the max of 20%.

> I have also attached the State of California's petitions. The State ceded all operational control of these parcels a LONG time ago, pursuant to the agreement I furnished Miranda last week. The state parcels total 2.01%.
> I haven't forgotten the minor edits to the MDP/ER. Just prioritizing the petition drive right now, and will make those edits when there's a lull. Thanks!
>
> Warmest regards,

> TARA DEVINE
> DEVINE STRATEGIES
> 645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
> Los Angeles, CA 90015
> 310.430.5121
> tara@devine-strategies.com
>
> Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
> Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

2 attachments

- CITY OF LA.pdf 208K
- STATE OF CALIF.pdf 164K

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 11:07 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Hi Tara.

CD 11 is working to obtain a letter from the State in regards to its petition.
Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

---

**Tara Devine** <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Cc: Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Thanks. I have seen the letter but am not aware of any response from the state. I will touch base with Debbie to see if anything has transpired.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Tara Devine** <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Cc: Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Debbie did not hear anything from the state, so she is following up today.

[Quoted text hidden]
5.20  Exhibit 20 – June 15 2016 Devine/Clerk emails Venice Beach BID Petitions
Fwd: Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/15/16
3 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 4:30 PM
To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

FYI to let you know where we are at, and update you regarding Metro as well (see my email to Mario below.)
Yesterday's Mario-verified total was 27.9%. Today's petitions appear complete, so I expect we will be at 28.41% once confirmed.
We have almost 1.5% stuck in verification limbo. I am trying to resolve all of them.
The largest (0.86%) is one that I believe Mario has moved up to you for a decision, Miranda.
Snapshot LLC has a 65-year ground lease on a parcel owned by Ekker. Snapshot has signed their petition, but have preliminarily indicated that they will probably not provide a copy of their lease. They are checking with their attorneys; I have had radio silence from them for several days. I do not know why, but I get the sense that they are unwilling to make the lease contents public. Many companies are very protective of information they perceive as proprietary. Is there any alternate form of proof they can offer?

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 4:22 PM
Subject: Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/15/16
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today's petitions - two petitions for three properties
If these are verified, I have us at 28.41%.

Also, Metro P&P Committee voted today to support. Goes to board next Thursday, so we will clear threshold then if not sooner.

ARGYROPOULOS.PDF
274K

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 4:36 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

The City's petition was signed today.
[Quoted text hidden]

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 4:53 PM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

That (City only, not State, assuming all City petitions will be verified) puts us at an official 50.87% + 0.52% unofficial/submitted today that I believe are complete.

- We have 1.5% submitted/unverified aka "provisional.
- Metro is 1.94%.
- We have another approx. 3%+ that has been verbally committed but not executed yet.
I think that ultimately we will end up somewhere between 54-56% -- or possibly even higher.
5.21 Exhibit 21 – June 15 2016 Devine/Montez emails Venice Beach BID Petitions
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/15/16

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  

Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 4:22 PM

Today's petitions - two petitions for three properties
If these are verified, I have us at 28.41%.

Also, Metro P&P Committee voted today to support. Goes to board next Thursday, so we will clear threshold then if not sooner.

ARGYROPOULOS.PDF
274K
5.22 Exhibit 22 – June 15, 2016 Tara Devine discussing database revisions with Garen Yegparian
Re: Revised Venice Beach BID database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>  
Cc: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>  

Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 11:14 AM

Garen:

Thank you for your review. Do you have a few minutes anytime today to discuss? Tyler is in Korea this week (not reachable) so I'd like to see if I can resolve this in his absence or not.

I may need to be at Metro between 1:30-3 pm but am otherwise open.

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Jun 13, 2016 4:41 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello Tara,

I've gone over the changes you addressed with the following results:

- 4286009091 - OK as modified
- 4286009092 - OK as modified
- 4286012041 - OK as modified
- 4286028021 - OK as modified
- 4286028022 - see below
- 4286028023 - see below
- 4286028024 - see below
- 4286028026 - see below
- 4286028027 - see below
- 4286028028 - see below
- 4286028029 - see below
- 4286028030 - see below
- 4286028031 - see below
- 4286008001 - OK as modified

For 4286028*** parcels, based on the fact that the two sets of APNs involved are in one building each, dividing up the frontage in the way you are proposing is not allowable. I looked in the assessment methodology, and did not see anything that specifically allows for this kind of allocation of frontage. If there is something I'm missing, please let me know, and this will be wrapped up quickly, since the arithmetic itself is correct.

Thank you for your patience, Tara.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:19 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I know I sometimes struggle to keep track of these documents and versions, so just to make it easier, here is the most current version again. As you may recall, Tyler submitted a bunch on changes on 5/23, and I made one more the following day (5/24.)

Tyler's notes on his changes (5/23):

Attached please find an updated database for Venice Beach BID. The changes are reflected in the first tab labeled as VB Assessments-Updated, and the second tab labeled as VB Assessments-Original is there as a reference.

I made changes to the following APNs:

- 4286009091 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
• 4286009092 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
• 4286012041 - Split the APN to two (4286012044 & 4286012045) and deleted the 041 as County has updated the APN
• 4286028021 - Reduced bldg sf by 100, and reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028022 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028023 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028024 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028026 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028027 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028028 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028029 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028030 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
• 4286028031 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg

The changes will decrease the total assessment by $4,904.61 which is approximately 0.26% change.

My notes on my change (5/24):

- 42860008001- We have removed 187 from the F-commercial column (AS) as it is duplicative. The correct frontage of 188.82 remains in the F-residential column (AV.) The very first database was correct; we believe that somewhere during review/revisions that the frontage was accidentally added in again in the commercial column, resulting in a double charge for frontage. We reviewed other parcels looking for duplicate frontage; we found the error was isolated to this APN.

This results in that APN's assessment being reduced from $5859.49 to $3,150.60 and a corresponding reduction in the total budget.

Total change to budget during petition stage: -$7,613.50

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621
5.23  Exhibit 23 – June 15, 2016 Tara Devine discussing database revisions and MDP/ER timing with Clerk’s office
Venice MDP/ER - status
2 messages

**Tara Devine** <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 5:54 PM

To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Debbie asked me about MDP/ER. In case you are also wondering status:

We can't do them until I settle database with Garen. He has questions about one owner's parcels. My database guy is in Korea until Sunday (unreachable) but I am hoping to resolve them before then. Garen and I played phone tag today.

Need final approved database as even the slightest change impacts every single table and almost every number in both the MDP and ER.

I can turnaround my changes in 1-2 days once I have final dbase, and am hoping Ed can do same (I've advised him they are coming.)

---

**Miranda Paster** <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Thu, Jun 16, 2016 at 8:51 AM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Hi Tara.

Thank you for the update.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png
5.24 Exhibit 24 – June 17 2016 Devine/Clerk emails Venice Beach BID Petitions I
Fwd: Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/17/16

5 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 5:11 PM
To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Just FYI, updated petition threshold below.

Also, I think we have the database okayed or darn close. Garen asked us to add some language to the MDP/ER to elaborate on the methodology used. Ed submitted this language last night; I did not see a reply from Garen today unless I was not cc'd, but I will proceed with my MDP edits (I don't believe our numbers will change) over the weekend, and will find out when Ed can complete his. I know Ed is out Tuesday for medical (Diane.) So my hope is to have revised MDP/ER done on Monday; if not, it could be Wednesday.

At the appropriate time, I am happy to request that CM Price's office waive this item (or support your request if you prefer to make it.) Marisa has been kind enough to help me in the past. I also have a good relationship with the CM and another member of his staff. I can also help with CP Wesson's office at the appropriate time, if desired.

Have a great weekend!

Warmest regards,
Tara

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 5:02 PM
Subject: Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/17/16
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today's petitions - three in one file
One petition/two parcels is the now-complete Sherman, Russell petition (previously incomplete/provisional)
Plus two more condos that appear fully complete to me.

If all three of these are valid, I have us at 51.67%. (1.26% provisional)
I have more I expect next week - almost 4% at minimum (Metro, Thornton Venice, Tramco)

---

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 10:52 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Good Morning Tara.

I hope that all is working well for you. At the appropriate time, we can request the chair of Economic Development Committee to waive the item if necessary. The question is why does it need to be waived from Committee given that the Ordinance of Establishment for this report will not be adopted in time to make the County tax rolls (deadline 7/15/16)? We can not schedule anything in Council or Committee without a reviewed and approved MDP/ER (which we do not have yet) nor can we request the City Attorney to sign the Ordinance of Intention. In addition, having the public hearing in Committee will ensure that it moves quickly in Council. We will have more than enough time to hand invoice
the assessments without having the item waived from Econ. Dev. Committee. Thank you for the offer to call the Council office, we do not believe that it is appropriate for a Consultant to request the Committee to waive the item.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, "Hoppes, Shannon" <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, "Wolcott, Holly" <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:22 PM

Hello Tara.

As mentioned in our phone conversation, I checked on South Park II. The Ordinance of Intention (OOI) was adopted by Council on 5/20/15 and the public hearing was set for July 28, 2015 with the Ordinance of Establishment (OOE) adopted by Council on 7/29/15. The OOE was scheduled on a special agenda before the Summer recess, but Ccl didn't hold the members to consider the special agenda items. If it had, the OOE could have been adopted in time to make the County deadline of 7/15/15. It didn't make that deadline and was scheduled for 7/28/15.

For the proposed Venice BID, we are past the dates that South Park II was adopted. The Venice OOI will be going to Council around the time that the OOE was adopted for South Park II. If everything moves forward (petition requirement, review of MDP/ER, City Atty signs OOI, Clerk Report & Scheduling of matter before Committee 72 hours in advance), and the matter is adopted by Committee on 6/28/16, the matter would have to go to Council on Friday, July 1, 2016. A placeholder could be made. However, these dates are still past the dates of South Park II's initial OOI adoption. We can rush everything, but everything is dependent on factors which would have to be completed by Wednesday 10 am (the deadline for getting an item on the agenda). Pursuant to State's Streets and Hwys Code and the Govt Code its requirement of a public hearing with 45 day notice, the OOE for Venice will not make the County's deadline no matter how we rush.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine  <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, "Hoppes, Shannon" <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, "Wolcott, Holly" <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:29 PM

Ah, thank you. I understand the difference. This is, however, all the more reason why we are extremely anxious to get the OOI in before recess. We have lost many, many weeks at many junctures, and losing 3+ more here is going to put us in greater jeopardy of not being able to start services on Jan 1. I feel confident in saying that failure to start services Jan 1 is going to make CD11 and my client deeply unhappy. It will also disappoint all those who have signed petitions in support of the BID thus far - a really wide spectrum of large, mid-size and small owners.

I believe that, throughout this process, we have really worked VERY hard to expedite everything that has been asked of us, at all stages of this process. I would appreciate anything we can all do to get the OOI through before recess.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA  90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>, "Hoppes, Shannon" <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, "Wolcott, Holly" <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

To my knowledge, the only thing you are waiting for from us is the revised ER/MDP. We cannot complete that until the database we submitted on 5/24 is approved by your staff. We are at a standstill. Every table and most of the numbers in-line in the text change if there is the slightest change to the database.

If there is anything else outstanding from us, please let me know and it rises to the immediate top of my list.
5.25 Exhibit 25 – June 17 2016 Devine/Clerk emails Venice Beach BID Petitions II
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/17/16, Part II
1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 6:29 PM
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader
< Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>
Cc: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott
<Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

In addition to the petitions I sent around 5 pm today, I just received more petitions signed by the owners of Thornton Venice LLC and Tramco Mgmt LLC.

This batch is quite large (1.98%).

Mario - the petition assessment amounts/% for several (but not all) of the parcels on the attached petitions changed on 5/24. It is not a large change overall. I mentioned this situation to you earlier. These petitions include several parcels whose frontage, bldg or lot were updated due to new information gained during the petition drive. We’ve been working with Garen to get these changes approved on the 5/24 database.

My understanding is that Garen expects to complete his database review on Monday.

Garen - will you be so kind as to let Mario know when these parcels' new data has been okayed? They will not all match up neatly with his current parcel tally, so I believe he will probably want confirmation from you prior to verifying the petitions.

Mario - all of the attached appear properly executed to me; however, I will mark them as provisional until Garen has a chance to confirm. We would like to be able to add them to our official total prior to Council. We also hope to have Metro’s petition prior to Council, and perhaps a few others as well. I expect Metro to sign on or shortly after 6/23, pending Board approval that day. With all verified, we could end up pretty close to, or even in excess of 56% for the OOI, which I think would be really great.

Everyone else - FYI. I’m trying to keep everyone in the loop so that we can try to get the OOI in Council prior to recess. I really appreciate everyone’s help!

THORNTONVENICE TRAMCO.pdf
829K
5.26 Exhibit 26 – June 20, 2016 Tara Devine discussing database revisions with Garen Yegparian
Revised Venice Beach database
1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>  
Cc: Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Dear Garen:

Please review the attached. I have updated the file name with the current date. I like to keep the database date current with any new version of the MDP/ER to help limit confusion about which is the current database. Ed and I are standing by - we hope to generate the revised MDP and ER today following your review.

The parcels we discussed have been restored to the prior methodology.

During our call, I neglected to obtain from you the two newly created (April 2016?) APNs you said you found. I realized this almost immediately after we spoke today, and tried calling you back, but I got your voicemail. I am sorry to ask this favor, but in the interest of urgency/expediency, is it possible for you to add these two new parcels in? If not, please advise the APNs in question asap.

Please include Tyler, Ed and myself on your reply so we are all up to speed on the latest. I really appreciate your help.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

2016.06.21 Venice database - post-petition & pre-OOL.xlsx
492K
5.27 Exhibit 27 – June 20, 2016 Tara Devine discussing petitions with Mario Montez
Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/17/16

3 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 5:02 PM
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today's petitions - three in one file
One petition/two parcels is the now-complete Sherman, Russell petition (previously incomplete/provisional)
Plus two more condos that appear fully complete to me.

If all three of these are valid, I have us at 51.67%, (1.26% provisional)
I have more I expect next week - almost 4% at minimum (Metro, Thornton Venice, Tramco)

SHERMAN R ZAMORA TOSSANI.pdf
4089K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 10:44 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tara,

Just wanted to confirm updated petition count is now 52.18%. This includes the Sherman, Tossani and Zamora petition as well as the Tramco petition completed by new owner 1011 OFW OWNER LLC. For now, the Thornton petitions are provisional.

Thanks
Mario

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 11:49 AM
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Ah, thank you!

I forgot that there were no changes to Tramco...just to some of the Thornton parcels. I had marked Tramco provisional as well. My total now matches yours.

[Quoted text hidden]
Exhibit 28 – June 20, 2016 Tara Devine discussing timing of database work
Re: URGENT: Need your help

1 message

Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 9:00 AM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>

We made the changes late last night and sent the revised database just before midnight. We are awaiting final review.

On Jun 21, 2016 7:46 AM, "Miranda Paster" <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning.

Garen finished his review and indicated that you are planning to undo some changes to 2 buildings. He finished the review of Ed's changes from last week on yesterday. Dennis is out today.

What else can we do for you?

Thank you.

On Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:40 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
We are going to lose 3 weeks minimum if the database is not approved asap. We cannot final the ER and MDP until we have an approved database - every table, and many of the in-line numbers change with any change to the database.

My understanding is that Weds is the last day to get this item in the queue to go to Council before a 3-week recess.

Failure to go to Council before recess greatly increases our chances of the BID not starting services on Jan 1 - an outcome that is going to make my head roll, and is going to deeply disappoint the BID's many supporters.

I know Ed is unavailable Tuesday due to medical issues - and I can make some of his ER edit for him, but not all of them.

Please, all, I am asking for your help. This is my top priority; I will do anything within my power. Whatever is easiest and most expedient is really needed, now.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png
Exhibit 29 – June 21, 2016 11:34 a.m. Tara Devine discussing database with Garen Yegparian
Parcel changes - petition
1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 11:34 AM

FYI, I just checked the APNs we discussed:

None of the parcels with minor assessment changes that we just discussed have signed their petitions, so it does not have an impact on our petition total. All of them are owners we tried to reach and failed thus far to do so. I believe all but one are known to our Steering Committee, who made quite a few efforts to talk to each of them.
Re: Parcel changes - petition
1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 11:37 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

OK, that makes life easier.

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 11:34 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
FYI, I just checked the APNs we discussed:

None of the parcels with minor assessment changes that we just discussed have signed their petitions, so it does not have an impact on our petition total. All of them are owners we tried to reach and failed thus far to do so. I believe all but one are known to our Steering Committee, who made quite a few efforts to talk to each of them.

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621
5.30  Exhibit 30 – June 21, 2016 2:42 p.m. Tara Devine discussing database with Garen Yegparian
I don’t know that I understand your last voicemail which said two APNs are Zone 1 but should be Zone 2.

I just checked 4286-009-074 and -075 in the most recent version I sent you, and both show as Zone 2 (just as all the other parcels in the same building.) The assessments in my copy are also consistent with Zone 2.

So yes, both of the APNs you specified in your voice mail should be in Zone 2, and they are in my version that we sent late last night (2016.06.21 Venice database - post-petition & pre-OOI.)
5.31  Exhibit 31 – June 22 2016 emails re database problems in relation to MDP revisions
Re: URGENT: Need your help

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>
Cc: Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>, Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Thank you so much. We beat our heads against the proverbial wall for a while.

I am on standby to finish the MDP, and I believe Ed is endeavoring to be as available as he can to complete the ER.

On Jun 22, 2016 9:07 AM, "Dennis Rader" <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:
Tara, after looking at the various databases I think I may have found the problem. Let me have Mario work on it and get back to you.

On Wed, Jun 22, 2016 at 7:54 AM, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara.

I have asked Dennis to work with Mario on this matter. Dennis will get back to you. Garen is not in the office today.

Thank you.

On Wed, Jun 22, 2016 at 7:38 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
We have an issue that we are, thus far, unable to resolve. Ed and I have taken the MDP and ER as far as we can go without solving this. We have each dedicated several hours (in addition to the MDP and ER edits) to try to solve this and have been unsuccessful.

Garen - if you would take a look and see if you can see something we're missing, we'd appreciate it.

The GREEN table at the bottom left of the main tab "VB Assessments" -- which, in turn feeds the 4th and 5th tabs -- no longer works on the version that was returned to us yesterday (not attached since we have not altered it.) I have looked at all of the formulas and they all appear correct, so I cannot figure out why they are not working. The green table feeds a very important table in the 4th tab "Assessment Source" of the spreadsheet for the MDP (and affects Ed's work even more extensively) I am really struggling to figure out why these tables are now generating a total budget (1st tab, cell I494) that is about $24K less than the correct total (1st tab, cell BJ470.)

I am attaching here the last version that we sent to the Clerk (Monday night) - at this time, the green table and the 4th tab were working and fully in sync with the main assessment total.

We cannot do anything further until this is resolved. This leaves me with a missing set of tables, and Ed with far more holes in his report. We will still need at least 2 hours to finish our work once this problem is resolved.

Tara

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 11:19 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
We are fine with the changes.

I completed MDP revisions tonight with the exception of a few items that I take directly from Ed's ER, and a final pass at pagination/cross-references to make sure they are all current and that there are no awkward page breaks, etc.

Ed is working on the ER now.

If we encounter no unforeseen issues, I expect to submit revised MDP/ER before 11am on Weds (will provide sooner if possible.)

Thank you all for all your help.

98
5.32 Exhibit 32 – June 22 2016 Tara Devine submits revised MDP and ER
REVISED ER: VENICE BEACH BID
4 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>       Wed, Jun 22, 2016 at 4:45 PM
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>, Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Attached please find the revised ER in Word and PDF format.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St., #110
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

2 attachments

- 6-22-16 Venice Beach BID ER FINAL with map v1.3.4.pdf 2066K
- 6-22-16 Venice Beach BID ER FINAL with map v1.3.4.docx 1409K

Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>       Wed, Jun 22, 2016 at 5:23 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Page 8, 7th line from the top, change "west" to "east"
Page 10, 4th line from the top, change "west" to "east"

[Quoted text hidden]

--
Rita Moreno
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
200 N. Spring Street, 2nd Floor #237
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Office (213) 978-1122
Fax (213) 978-1130

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>       Wed, Jun 22, 2016 at 5:39 PM
To: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>
Cc: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Damn, you'd think I would've thought to check the ER, too. Sorry - a bit tired from a very late night and early morning. Now fixed in ER.

Will re-send both to everyone once you tell me to do so.
5.33  Exhibit 33 – June 22 2016 emails Devine/Clerk Revised
MPD Update: Venice Beach BID
REVISED MDP: VENICE BEACH BID
5 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>, Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Attached please find the revised MDP in Word and PDF format. ER to follow shortly.

I will be on standby today to make edits if needed.

Tomorrow I am at Metro Board from approx. 8:30 until whenever our item is heard (VB petition) but I have cleared the rest of my day in the event anything is needed.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE  
DEVINE STRATEGIES  
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293  
Los Angeles, CA  90015  
310.430.5121  
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES  
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

2 attachments

- 2016.06.22 VB MDP FINAL.pdf  
  1763K
- 2016.06.22 VB MDP FINAL.docx  
  1640K

Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Cc: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Page 11, 4th line from the bottom, change "west" to "east"  
Page 14, 10th line from the top, change "west" to "east"

[Quoted text hidden]

--
Rita Moreno  
City of Los Angeles  
Office of the City Clerk  
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division  
200 N. Spring Street, 2nd Floor #237  
Los Angeles, CA  90012  
Office (213) 978-1122  
Fax (213) 978-1130

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Cc: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>, Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>
5.34 Exhibit 34 – June 23 2016 Metro Board of Directors meeting
agenda page 11
40. APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. ADOPTING the Development Guidelines for the joint development of 1.77 acres of Metro-owned property and 1.66 acres of County-owned property at the Expo/Crenshaw Station;

B. ADOPTING the Development Guidelines for the joint development of 1.44 acres of County-owned property at the Fairview Heights Station; and

C. AUTHORIZING an Agreement with the County of Los Angeles for administering the Metro Joint Development process for the County-owned properties at the Expo/Crenshaw and Fairview Heights Stations.

41. AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a six-month Short Term Exclusive Negotiation Agreement and Planning Document (Short Term ENA), with an option to extend up to three additional months, with Trammell Crow Company and Greenland USA, for the development of Metro-owned property at the North Hollywood Station (Site).

42. APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. SUPPORTING the establishment of the proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District ("BID") in the City of Los Angeles and the resulting assessments on properties within the District boundaries owned by Metro; and

B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") or his delegate to sign any necessary petitions and cast any subsequent ballots in support.
5.35 Exhibit 35 – June 24 2016 emails regarding State-owned property in BID
Call today?
38 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 8:54 AM
To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, "Sap, Craig" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Can we all do a quick conference call today to discuss?

I am available all day.
I believe Debbie is available until noon.

I will circulate a call-in # if a time can be identified. THANK YOU!

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 8:59 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Cc: "Sap, Craig" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Hi.

I have a meeting at 11 am & 2 pm otherwise I am free.
[Quoted text hidden]
--
Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>  
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 9:01 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

I am free all day
From: Miranda Paster [mailto:miranda.paster@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Tara Devine
Cc: Sap, Craig@Parks; Debbie DynerHarris
Subject: Re: Call today?

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: "Sap, Craig" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Cc: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 9:07 AM

Thank you very much, all. I will circulate a calendar appointment for 10am with call-in information.

[Quoted text hidden]

Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:15 AM

Craig Sap

District Superintendent

Angeles District

1925 Las Virgenes

Calabasas, CA. 91302

(818) 880-0396 Office

(310) 699-1732 Cell

(818) 880-0359 FAX

Please note that my new email address is: craig.sap@parks.ca.gov

From: Miranda Paster [mailto:miranda.paster@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Tara Devine
Cc: Sap, Craig@Parks; Debbie DynerHarris
Subject: Re: Call today?
Hi.

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Holdover Letters 12-14-1998.pdf**
422K

---

**Miranda Paster** <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: "Wolcott, Holly" <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>  
Cc: "Hoppes, Shannon" <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>  
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:18 AM

Hello.

Please note copies of the letters from State. I think these along w/ the agreement will allow the City to pay the assessments for the State parcels. Please let me know if you have any concerns. I will have Rita bring up the report shortly for signature.

Thank you.
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Holdover Letters 12-14-1998.pdf**
422K

---

**Miranda Paster** <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>  
Cc: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>  
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:27 AM

Hi Craig.

The Riordan letter looks great. Would you happen to have the signed version of the letter from Patrici Megason?

Thanks.
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Sap, Craig@Parks** <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Cc: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>  
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:29 AM

If it exists it would be in central records at our HQ's. I will check.

Craig Sap

District Superintendent

Angeles District

1925 Las Virgenes

Calabasas, CA. 91302

(818) 880-0396 Office

(310) 699-1732 Cell

(818) 880-0359 FAX
From: Miranda Paster [mailto:miranda.paster@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Sap, Craig@Parks
Cc: Tara Devine; Debbie DynerHarris
Subject: Re: Call today?

[Quoted text hidden]

Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov> Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:32 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

I just sent a request in. I should have it to you in the next hour or two.

Craig Sap
District Superintendent
Angeles District
1925 Las Virgenes
Calabasas, CA. 91302
(818) 880-0396 Office
(310) 699-1732 Cell
(818) 880-0359 FAX

Please note that my new email address is: craig.sap@parks.ca.gov

From: Miranda Paster [mailto:miranda.paster@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Sap, Craig@Parks
Cc: Tara Devine; Debbie DynerHarris
Subject: Re: Call today?

[Quoted text hidden]

Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov> Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:54 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Here are the agreements I could find.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=af60c5c81&view=pt&as_has=devine&as_sizeoperator=s_sl&as_sizeunit=s_smb&as_subset=all&as_within=1d&...
From: Miranda Paster [mailto:miranda.paster@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Sap, Craig@Parks
Cc: Tara Devine; Debbie DynerHarris
Subject: Re: Call today?

[Quoted text hidden]

6 attachments

- Joint Power Agreement.pdf
  1616K
- AgreementDec1947.pdf
  4562K
- AgreementNovember1948.pdf
  2249K
- dockwieler beach -agreement btwn state and rap.pdf
  1040K
- Venice Beach.pdf
  1788K
- City-County JPA.pdf
  1467K

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:59 AM
To: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>

Thank you very very much.

[Quoted text hidden]

Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org> Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:59 AM
To: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Cc: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  

Thanks Craig!

[Quoted text hidden]

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=af60c5c581&view=pt&as_has=devine&as_size=operator=s_sl&as_sizes=operator=s_slm&as_subset=all&as_within=1d&...
Download the City of Los Angeles MyLA311 app for smartphones!

MyLA311 links Angelenos with the services and information they need to enjoy their city, beautify their community and stay connected with their local government. With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away.

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:00 AM
To: Paul Liles <paul.liles@lacity.org>

Hello Paul.

I was able to get what I needed from the State. Please notice some of what he provided.

Thank you for your assistance.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Date: Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:54 AM
Subject: RE: Call today?
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>

6 attachments

Joint Power Agreement.pdf 1616K
AgreementDec1947.pdf 4562K
AgreementNovember1948.pdf 2249K
dockwiler beach-agreement btwn state and rap.pdf 1040K
Venice Beach.pdf 1786K
City-County JPA.pdf 1467K

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:01 AM
To: Paul Liles <paul.liles@lacity.org>
Hi

These holdover letters is what I needed.

Thanks.

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Date: Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:15 AM
Subject: RE: Call today?
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Craig Sap

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

422K

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:28 AM
To: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Cc: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

I just wanted to really say thank you to everyone for being available and so helpful today. THANK YOU and have a wonderful weekend.

[Quoted text hidden]

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:31 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Thank you and same to you.

[Quoted text hidden]

Paul Liles <paul.liles@lacity.org>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:50 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>

I'm glad that you found these. I'll put them in our files for future reference.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:53 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>

Ditto!

[Quoted text hidden]

Debbie Dyner Harris
District Director
Councilmember Mike Bonin
City of Los Angeles

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?l=v=2&l=af60c5c581&view=pt&as_has=devine&as_sizeoperator=s_s&as_sizeunit=s_smb&as_subset=all&as_within=1d&as...
Download the City of Los Angeles MyLA311 app for smartphones!

MyLA311 links Angelenos with the services and information they need to enjoy their city, beautify their community and stay connected with their local government. With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away.

---

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 11:55 AM
To: Paul Liles <paul.liles@lacity.org>

You are welcome.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>  Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 12:28 PM
To: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

All,

Our Central Office looked and found the same unsigned letter in their files. One thing note the bottom of the letter is signed by Southern Division Chief Dick Troy, Chief Counsel Tim LaFranchi, and Deputy Director Ken Jones.

Craig Sap
District Superintendent
Angeles District
1925 Las Virgenes
Calabasas, CA. 91302
(818) 880-0396 Office
(310) 699-1732 Cell
(818) 880-0359 FAX

Please note that my new email address is: craig.sap@parks.ca.gov
From: Debbie DynerHarris [mailto:debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 11:53 AM
To: Miranda Paster
Cc: Tara Devine; Sap, Craig@Parks
Subject: Re: Call today?

[Quoted text hidden]

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 12:36 PM
To: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thank you. We submitted the report w/ the letters you provided. Thank you again Craig.
[Quoted text hidden]

Sap, Craig@Parks <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 12:38 PM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thanks! This was easy fix to a complicated issue.

Craig Sap
District Superintendent
Angeles District
1925 Las Virgenes
Calabasas, CA. 91302
(818) 880-0396 Office
(310) 699-1732 Cell
(818) 880-0359 FAX

Please note that my new email address is: craig.sap@parks.ca.gov

From: Miranda Paster [mailto:miranda.paster@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 12:37 PM
To: Sap, Craig@Parks
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris; Tara Devine
Subject: Re: Call today?

[Quoted text hidden]

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 12:39 PM
To: "Sap, Craig@Parks" <Craig.Sap@parks.ca.gov>

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=af60c5c581&view=pt&as_has=devine&as_sizeoperator=s_sl&as_sizenot=a...
5.36 Exhibit 36 – June 24 through July 19 2016 lengthy email exchange regarding Snapshot parcel and petitions
Venice Beach BID petition: 6/24/16
12 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 3:33 PM

Mario:

Ekker (owner) / Snapshot LLC (tenant)
Previously submitted but required add'l documentation due to ground lease
I included the petition again at the start of the file so you would not need to search for it
Following it is the documentation for the ground lease
FYI, the owner is also supportive of the BID but is not the appropriate signatory (Ekker is aka Scharff, who already signed for numerous properties)
Please confirm if this petition is now validated or if anything else is required

Miranda/Rita: Just FYI. Also, Metro not yet rec'd.

Thank you all - and have a great weekend!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

SNAPSHOT w documentation.pdf
2887K

Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Mon, Jun 27, 2016 at 2:00 PM

Miranda,

Please see attached email with lease attachment regarding Venice Beach petition completed by lessee Snapshot. The county shows owner as Ekker Leslie Co Tr & Simone Scharff Tr. Tara sent us the lease documentation we had previously asked for last Friday afternoon. The petition in question is also attached ($16,028.20, 0.86%). The petition was left as pending and was not counted as part of the petition tally.

Thanks
Mario
[Quoted text hidden]

SNAPSHOT w documentation.pdf
2887K

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
Wed, Jun 29, 2016 at 11:42 AM
The property owner asked me today if the documentation was accepted. Please let me know when you can if Ekker/Snapshot is now validated.

---

**Mario Montez**<mario.montez@lacity.org>  
To: **Miranda Paster**<miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
**Wed, Jun 29, 2016 at 1:21 PM**

--- Forwarded message ---

**From:** Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
**Date:** Wed, Jun 29, 2016 at 11:42 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Venice Beach BID petition: 6/24/16  
**To:** Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

---

**Miranda Paster**<miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: "Numano-Hiura, Christy"<christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>  
Cc: "Montez, Mario" <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
**Wed, Jun 29, 2016 at 1:53 PM**

Hello Christy.

Can we accept this petition with the attached documentation?

Thank you.

---

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

SNAPSHOT w documentation.pdf

2887K

---

**Miranda Paster**<miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: "Numano-Hiura, Christy"<christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>  
Cc: "Montez, Mario" <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
**Thu, Jun 30, 2016 at 2:25 PM**

The tenant is indicating the right to sign the petition w/ the lease agreement.

---

**Christy Numano-Hiura**<christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Cc: "Montez, Mario" <mario.montez@lacity.org>  
**Thu, Jun 30, 2016 at 3:02 PM**

I've cut and pasted a previous email related to this issue.

**Christy Numano-Hiura**<christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
**Tue, Mar 22, 2011 at 11:25 AM**

In reply to your questions:

Q: Can you refresh my memory as to whether or not a lessee w/ a triple net lease can sign a petition or ballot?

We do not recall giving advice on this matter. Per Proc 218, the record owner must be given notice and a ballot. PBID law requires the property owner sign the petition. As to whether a tenant can be given a ballot as opposed to
the property owner, we have consistently advised that per Prop 218, only tenants who are directly liable to pay for the assessment, are entitled to vote. Such tenants should provide you with a long term lease (at least 20 years) that shows, to your satisfaction, that the tenant is directly liable for payment of the assessment. **Note**, if the tenant breaks the lease, you will have no recourse. Hence, you should be very careful when deciding whether to allow a tenant to vote.

Q: As to your question re: GC 54954.6(c), you will see that S.H. 36623(b) provides as follows:

"If a city council proposes to levy a new or increased business assessment, the notice and protest and hearing procedure shall comply with Section 54954.6 of the Government Code, except that notice shall be mailed to the owners of the businesses proposed to be assessed..."

Let me know if you still need assistance. Thanks.

Christy

So as I indicated in my phone message, the document provided by Snapshot is insufficient to prove they would be directly liable to pay for the assessment or that they have legal authority to sign the petition/vote for the BID. An assignment only assigns those rights, title and interest held by the assignor at the time of assignment. Without looking at all the documents referenced in the assignment, there's no way to determine what right(s), title and interest(s), if any, were legally assigned to Snapshot. Additionally, the document is not an official record.

Let me know if you have additional questions. Thanks.

Christy

[Quoted text hidden]

**************************Confidentiality Notice**************************

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney, which may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

**************************Confidentiality Notice**************************

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
To: Christy Numano-Hiura <christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>
Cc: "Montez, Mario" <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Thank you Mario.

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>
Cc: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>

I have not received confirmation of validation for the Ekker/Snapshot parcel. I would like to be sure it has been validated because I suspect they may end up having to request a duplicate ballot by mail (the ballot was probably mailed to the owner of record rather than the tenant, who holds a 65-year ground lease.) Please confirm if the attached documentation validates the petition. I also have some additional submissions.

**Submissions:**
OLD: 0.86% Ekker/Snapshot - documentation submitted on 6/24. (see below; petition & documentation attached again.)
NEW: 1.94% Metro's petition is attached
NEW: 0.14% Murez, James & Melanie - petition was previously submitted but marked provisional pending documentation of ownership - the petition and supporting documentation attached.

This should add almost 3% more to our petition approval threshold of 52.31% (at the time of the Clerk report for Council.
I may end up getting another couple before we return to Council, and there's one more largish set of provisional petitions I may end up being able to clear (I've been having trouble getting the documentation.)

Warmest regards,

Tara

[Quoted text hidden]
Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Cc: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>  

Mon, Jul 18, 2016 at 2:48 PM

Hello Tara,

Is this documentation different from what was initially emailed from us?

[Quoted text hidden]

Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!
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Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Cc: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>  

Mon, Jul 18, 2016 at 5:17 PM

No. What I submitted via email is the same documentation - Assignment of Lease (Ground Lease.)

I have now also received a copy of the 99-year ground lease (60+ pages, executed in 1979) and an amendment to the lease (19 pages, executed in 1983). They opted to redact a small amount of information in the lease due to confidentiality concerns.

Would the ground lease and amendment be helpful?

We also need clarity re: ballot, which I presume was sent to the owner of record (Ekker.) Ekker has maintained that they lack the authority to sign the petition or return the ballot due to the 99-year ground lease that began in 1979.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE  
DEVINE STRATEGIES  
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
310.430.5121  
tara@devine-strategies.com  

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES  
Planning & Entitlements  |  Political & Community Outreach  |  Business Improvement Districts

[Quoted text hidden]

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
To: "Montez, Mario" <mario.montez@lacity.org>, "Rader, Dennis" <dennis.rader@lacity.org>  

Thu, Jul 21, 2016 at 9:52 AM

fyi  
---------- Forwarded message ----------  
From: Christy Numano-Hiura <christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=c3b7d10088&view=pt&q=tara%40devine-strategies.com&qs=true&search=query&th=155848c0f773e9e&simi=155...
Miranda,

In researching your question, I have learned that for property tax purposes, a leasehold interest of 35 years or more constitutes a change of ownership. (R&T section 61; 462.100)

Therefore, assuming the you are satisfied that the records support the BID’s contention that Snapshot is the legal assignee and lessee of the 99 year lease, then Snapshot may vote in lieu of the owner of record.

Please note however, the R&T section 462.160(b) further provides that where a trust is involved (as is the case here), if the lease is between parent-child/grandparent-grandchild, then the long term lease does not constitute a change of ownership. I recommend your staff look into this as well.

Christy

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Date: Tue, Jul 19, 2016 at 2:24 PM
Subject: Re: Venice Beach BID petition: 6/24/16
To: Christy Numano-Hiura <christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>

If the entire document reads in the same way and without stipulations to the contrary, then it is okay to approve the ballot?

On Tue, Jul 19, 2016 at 2:16 PM, Christy Numano-Hiura <christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org> wrote:
   I recommend you request and review the entire agreement.

Although the language in the 2 pages you sent does appear to indicate that the lessor will not pay "any taxes as to the property" and that lessee is to pay "All taxes of every kind and nature levied on the premises..", there's no way of knowing who that parties are, and there could be other provisions that place limitations on these provisions. There could also be provisions that provide more assurance that the owner is hands-off. I would recommend against just taking their word for it based on these 2 pages.

Christy

On Mon, Jul 18, 2016 at 5:42 PM, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:
   Hello Christy
   
   Does the attached allow us to accept the lessee signing the petition and the ballot?
   
   Thank you.

On Mon, Jul 18, 2016 at 5:39 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
   The lease clearly states that the lessee is responsible for the direct payment of property and other taxes to the respective taxing authority. I've attached a 2-page except from the lease that has this language - if you want 70+ more pages (whole package) let me know.
   Sorry for the small print/poor quality. I think it's a photocopy circa 1983. You might need the magnifying glass :)

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
On Mon, Jul 18, 2016 at 5:21 PM, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:

According to the information that we have, both items should be sent to owner of record.

If the 99-year ground lease specifically indicates that the lessee has the right to sign on behalf of the property owner, it will be helpful.

[Quoted text hidden]

***************Confidentiality Notice ****************************
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5.37   Exhibit 37 – June 28 2016 Economic Development Committee Tara Devine speaker card
CITY OF LOS ANGELES SPEAKER CARD

NOTE: THIS IS A PUBLIC DOCUMENT SUBJECT TO POSTING ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE. YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE PERSONAL INFORMATION IN ORDER TO SPEAK, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY FOR THE PRESIDING OFFICER TO CALL UPON YOU

Date 6/28/16

THE CITY COUNCIL'S RULES OF DECORUM WILL BE ENFORCED.

I wish to speak before the Economic Development Committee

Name of City Agency, Department, Committee or Council

Do you wish to provide general public comment, or to speak for or against a proposal on the agenda? X For proposal

Name: Tara Divine

( ) Against proposal

Business or Organization Affiliation: Divine Strategies

( ) General comments

Address: 665 W. Ninth St. #110-293 LA, CA 90015

City State Zip

Business phone: 310-436-5121 Representing: see below

CHECK HERE IF YOU ARE A PAID SPEAKER AND PROVIDE CLIENT INFORMATION BELOW:

Client Name: Venice Beach Property Owners' Association

Client Address: 8 Horizon Ave., Venice CA 90291

Phone #:

State Zip

Please see reverse of card for important information and submit this entire card to the presiding officer or chairperson.
5.38 Exhibit 38 – July 18 2016 Email exchange with Jed Pauker re BID Boundaries
Re: Venice Beach BID - geography
1 message

Tara Devine
To: Debbie Dyner Harris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>  
Cc: Taylor Bazley <taylor.bazley@lacity.org>, Jed Pauker

Mon, Jul 18, 2016 at 6:50 PM

Hello all -

Attached is a map of the proposed Venice Beach BID area.

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Thu, Jul 14, 2016 at 2:19 PM, Debbie Dyner Harris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org> wrote:
Hello Jed. I do not have a map that I am able to scan, but here is a description of the boundaries- all commercially-zoned parcels in the following area:

the west is Ocean Front Walk (excluding the sand)
the south is South Venice Blvd.
the north is Barnard Way/the City of Santa Monica border
the east is irregular includes Marine Court, Horizon Court, north along Speedway and Ocean Front Walk

In addition, I am also copying Tara Devine, who worked on the BID formation, as she may have a copy of the map available for you.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Debbie

On Thu, Jul 14, 2016 at 2:10 PM, Taylor Bazley <taylor.bazley@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Jed,

The BID is, of course, being organized separately from the council office, however, I am sure we probably have some map. Debbie, our District Director, who I included in this email, is more knowledgeable about the BID than I and could probably better help with your request for a map.

Best,
Taylor

On Thu, Jul 14, 2016 at 1:48 PM, Jed Pauker wrote:
Hi Taylor,

I hope all is well. I'm trying to understand the coordinates of the Venice Beach BID.

Might you be able to point me to a resource that is able to provide a clear map of the affected area?

Thanks,
Jed Pauker
Dear Mr. Kuel,

We received the letter and will send you a written response today via email and USPS. Please excuse the delay.

Thank you.

Rita

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: "William Kuel" <hans.kuel@exnihilo65.com>
Date: Jul 27, 2016 9:27 AM
Subject: Proposed Venice BID & Residential Properties Zoned Commercial
To: <Holly.Wolcott@lacity.org>, <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: "Tara Devine" <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Hi, my wife and I mailed certified the letter and map below (also attached) on July 15 to everyone in the address line and have not heard any response as yet. Please contact us in some form to let us know if we have any options.

Thank you,
Bill & Laura Kuel

July 14, 2016

Holly Wolcott, City Clerk
200 N. Spring St., Room 360
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Venice BID & 1307 Innes Place, Venice, CA 90291; APN: 4238011022

Dear Ms. Wolcott,

Upon the advice of Tara Devine of Devine Strategies, this letter is addressed to you with copies sent to The Honorable Mike Bonin, Debbie Dyner-Harris, and Miranda Paster.

We are writing because of the proposed Venice BID and the adverse impact it will have on our property. Based upon the state and city laws that Ms. Devine has cited us, the inclusion of our property, along with the adjacent property at 120 Westminster (and many others, we’re sure) strikes us as arbitrary and inherently unfair.

While the concept of a Venice BID is sound in principal, and apparently effective in other parts of Los Angeles and the rest of the country, it’s application would place undue hardship on our ability to continue offering residential rentals. We have owned, lived in and managed a small fourplex, under rent control, in Venice for the past 20 years and, at present, lease out two of the units—both at below market rent.

The BID incorporates all commercial, industrial, and government-zoned parcels, but exempts all residential-zoned parcels except R4 and R5 (of which the Venice BID area has none, according to Ms. Devine). It is our misfortune that our parcel is, for whatever reason, zoned C4. The apartment building on our lot was built by Abbot Kinney in 1910 and has always, and only, operated as four small one-bedroom apartments. The larger multi-unit building next door at 120 Westminster has over a dozen units and is of similar age and always been used for residential purposes, but is zoned commercial as well.

Directly across the back alleyway (Park Row) from both buildings, there are two other multi-unit apartment buildings at 1302 & 1304 Pacific Ave., each with 7 or more units (we believe), but they are zoned residential. If you look at the enclosed proposed Venice BID map, you can see how they are exempted by a carved-out, zig-zag U-shape in our immediate area. Meanwhile, all the other parcels between Speedway and Pacific (all the way to Main on the other side of the Westminster dog park, including all the rest of Innes Place going northwest) are zoned residential and are exempt. Many of these properties are multi-unit rentals operated by absentee owners and/or professional management companies.
The proposed BID assesses our parcel not only on street frontage, but also on the alleyway, for a total of just under $2,200. The BID represents a full 42% increase in our property taxes from 2014-15. Given the age of our fourplex, we are already hard-pressed financially to maintain the property in sound condition (which we do and will continue to, regardless). Also, in the interests of attracting and maintaining good long-term tenants, we have consistently offered the rental units at below market rents and do not raise the rents every 12 months, as we’re allowed to under rent control. We occupy the other 2 units as our home.

At the same time, other multi-units in the area, including at least one of the aforementioned exempt buildings on Pacific, are running illegal Air BnB-type short-term rentals (this is another issue in itself, as many of their guests often party loudly late into the night, vomiting and urinating off the balconies). At least two of the originators of the BID proposal are being sued by the city for running illegal hotels. Their properties are not exempt, but if they were converted back to apartment buildings they would face larger tax bills, making it harder to offer affordable units. In any event, they are large beachside properties that I’m sure would command top rents. If you are interested in maintaining any semblance of affordable rental housing in Venice, you may wish to consider the impact of the BID on the small mom & pop residential operations such as ours that are included in the BID. Our current and future tenants will most likely have to share some or all of the brunt of the BID in terms of their monthly rent.

Our real dilemma is that there is apparently no redress under current state and city law to address our particular situation. I quote Ms. Devine:

"Here’s what I do know:
- Regardless of whose decision it is, the City does not allow LA BIDs to include R-zoned properties within BID boundaries unless they are R4 or R5. (NOTE: There is currently no R4 or R5 within the area of the Venice BID; Venice may not even have any R4 or R5.)
- I have been told that R4 and R5 are eligible to be included and assessed because those zones allow mixed-use in LA (most commonly, this = residential over commercial.)
- Other cities in California interpret the state law differently.
- California BIDs are governed by the Property and Business Improvement District Act of 1994 (California Streets and Highways Code Section 36000 et seq.) (sic). The residential issue is (sic) in Section 36632(c), which states:
   ‘Properties zoned solely for residential use, or that are zoned for agricultural use, are conclusively presumed not to benefit from the improvements and service funded through these assessments, and shall not be subject to any assessment pursuant to this part.’
- No further reasoning or guidance is given in the statute (so as with many laws, we are left open to interpretations.)
P.S. Note that ZONING is the determinant and not use. This is per state law, and no city in CA can abridge this without being in violation of state law. I suspect that your issue will circle back to this point."

We could stomach the assessment much easier if all properties in the proposed BID, meaning ALL multi-unit residential-zoned parcels, were included, but as such, we feel singled-out to have to, in effect, subsidize all these other exempt residential properties with the substantially higher property taxes we will face.

We would greatly appreciate any suggestions on options we may have, including seeking a zoning-change, if necessary. Other than the fact that our parcel is relatively close to the center of Venice near Windward Circle, where “downtown” Venice is or used to be, we don’t know why our residential property was zoned C4 to begin with.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

William & Laura Kuel

cc: The Honorable Mike Bonin; Debbie Dyner-Harris; Miranda Paster; Andrew Sanesi; Tara Devine
5.40 Exhibit 40 – July 27 2016 Holly Wolcott response to William Kuel
Dear Mr. Kuel,

Please find attached the response letter from the Office of the City Clerk. The original will be sent via USPS.

Thank you.

Rita

On Wed, Jul 27, 2016 at 2:23 PM, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org> wrote:
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]
July 27, 2016

William and Laura Kuel

RE: Proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District (BID) and 1307 Innes Place

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Kuel,

The Office of the City Clerk is in receipt of your letter, dated July 14, 2016, regarding property located at 1307 Innes Place, Venice, CA 90291 and the petition to establish the Venice Beach Business Improvement District. We have noted your concerns relative to the inclusion of the rent controlled property (Assessor’s ID No. 4238 011 022) in the proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District. The Office of the City Clerk, Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division has confirmed that 1307 Innes Place, Venice, CA 90291 is a four-unit residential property built in 1910 and, therefore, subject to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance. It is zoned C4 for commercial use (LAMC Chapter 1 Article 2 § 12.16), and can be assessed if an Engineer determines it will receive a special benefit.

In regards to the assessing of all multi-unit residential-zoned parcels, unless said parcels are zoned for commercial or industrial use, Proposition 218 prohibits the levy of an assessment in the establishment of a Business Improvement District on parcels zoned solely residential. Further, the City Clerk does not have the authority to remove or add any properties in a Business Improvement District. We will forward your letter and this information to the Engineer who determined that the property will receive special benefit from the Venice Beach Business Improvement District.

You also requested suggestions or options you may have such as applying for a zone change. Information on the process can be obtained from the Department of Building and Safety, Case Management Section at (213) 482-6864. You can also find information and the application to determine if any costs associated with a higher property tax bill can be passed on to the tenants, on the Housing and Community Impact Department’s website, under the Just and Reasonable Rent Adjustment Program (http://hcidla.lacity.org/Just-and-Reasonable-Rent-Adjustment-Program). In addition, the property is currently a non-contributing structure.
adjacent to the Lost Venice Canals Historic District (http://preservation.lacity.org/sites/default/files/Venice_Districts_1_175_0.pdf). You may wish to consider restoring the property to qualify for historic designation (http://preservation.lacity.org/commission) through the City’s Office of Historic Resources (http://preservation.lacity.org/), which can qualify you for a reduction in property taxes through the Mills Act or other preservation incentives (http://preservation.lacity.org/incentives), in order to maintain the historic character of the property.

If you have questions related to this letter, please contact Rita Moreno at (213) 978-1122 or via email: rita.moreno@lacity.org. Any questions about the proposed Venice Beach Business Improvement District should be directed to Tara Devine at tara@devine-strategies.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Holly L. Wolcott
City Clerk

cc: Ed Henning, Certified Engineer
    Hon. Councilmember Mike Bonin

HLW:MP:rm
5.41  Exhibit 41 – August 17, 18 2016 Tara Devine answering a reporter’s questions for Mike Bonin
Hi Miranda, I am sorry to bother you with one more thing, but we are trying to answer some questions for this Venice publication. Would you be able to check this over and see if there is anything missing/wrong/or something else?

Thank you so much!
Debbie

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Date: Thu, Aug 18, 2016 at 11:49 AM
Subject: Re: Venice BID Questions
To: david.grahamcaso <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org>
Cc: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Here are my answers to her questions. As mentioned, I think the Clerk should review these questions. I’ve highlighted in red those that they either should or may wish to respond to. Should my answers in any way conflict with theirs, I welcome you to use theirs. I do not expect that they will comment on boundary questions, as they are determined by property owner discussion (as well as the restrictions of state and local law.)

Is the voting structure fair? On the surface it seems that the owners who make up the majority of the total value of property are in support of the BID. How can a person who owns a small studio off the Boardwalk have their vote count against an entity as large as, say for example, Venice Breeze Suites? The voting process is consistent with state law, and with other special assessment districts. Voting is weighted by the weight of the assessment. A voter paying more does have a greater vote than a voter paying less. There are 42 BIDs in Los Angeles, and hundreds across the state of California, formed in the same way.

A lot of the land is owned by the city. Does the city get a vote? Yes, the City gets a vote. State law says that public/government parcels are not exempt from assessments. Anyone assessed gets a vote, proportional to the size of the assessment. The public property within the proposed Venice BID has a clear and direct relationship to the overall BID area. The proposed BID area is equally defined by its public and commercial spaces - it makes no sense to include private parcels and exclude the public parcels.

I’ve come across one lady, an 88 year old artist, who says she won’t be able to afford the assessment on her live/work studio. What happens in cases like this? I have not talked to this person (to my knowledge - at least no one has identified herself to me in this way.) I did talk to a male property owner of a similar age who lives on a very limited/fixed income, but he has elected to support the BID despite the financial obligation. I believe that if the assessment is not paid and is delinquent for a substantial period of time, at some point, the County Assessor can elect to place a lien on the property. The Clerk may be able to provide more information. I do not believe that there is any "hardship exemption" for property taxes or BID assessments. But again, Clerk or Assessor should answer this question.

Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific? The boundaries of the proposed Venice BID are specific (but they are not gerrymandered.) State law clearly specifies that zoning, not use, is the appropriate criteria. Per state and local law, the residentially-zoned properties in Venice are not eligible for BID assessment. The proposed BID includes all of the property eligible for assessment west of Abbott Kinney. Abbott Kinney has its own Merchants Association which already performs some functions similar to a BID. The "sawtooth" boundary lines are entirely due to a requirement that the proposed BID exclude residentially-zoned properties (which are not eligible for assessment.) If you look at a map of the zoning in the area, you can see that the boundary lines include the commercially-zoned, industrially-zoned and government/public facilities-zoned parcels, and exclude the residentially-zoned. This is consistent with state and local law.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=af60c5c581&view=pt&as_has=devine&as_size=operator=s_si&as_sizeunit=s_sm&as_subset=all&as_within=1&sel...
Why not just form an Ocean Front Walk BID?
See above.

Why not blanket the entire area of Venice?
See response to "Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific?"

Is there a risk that crime and grime will migrate off the Boardwalk and out of areas within the boundaries of the BID to other parts of Venice?
Crime and grime does not conform to any particular boundaries. That is a possibility with or without the proposed BID. The proposed BID arguably includes the area of Venice that is most attractive to criminal activity and blight. If a safer, cleaner environment within the proposed BID is created over time, it is likely that there will be a substantial reduction in overall criminal and blight activity within Venice.

Is the public hearing being held on the last day of voting? If so, why was the decision made to schedule it this way?
State law requires that the proposed BID ballots be out for 45 days. Clerk can tell you when they were mailed, and when that 45-day window expires (my best guess is a day or two before it's been scheduled for council.)

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Aug 17, 2016 at 2:11 PM, david grahamcaso <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org> wrote:
Yes, tomorrow is fine. Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 17, 2016, at 2:11 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Hi David -

I am out of the office today but back tomorrow. Can I respond to you on these question tomorrow? (No deadline mentioned in her email.)

Also, on her very last question, I would have the Clerk (Miranda, Rita or their designee) answer that. They are responsible for tracking that timetable and the council scheduling.

State law requires that the ballots be out for 45 days. Clerk can tell you when they were mailed, and when that 45-day window expires (my best guess is a day or two before it's been scheduled for council.)

Clerk may or may not wish to answer a couple of her other questions (I can provide an answer to questions #1 and #2, but if the Clerk wishes to take those, I would defer to them.)

The rest are really questions for me.

On Aug 17, 2016 1:59 PM, "Debbie DynerHarris" <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara. Can you please respond to her? Thanks

Sent from my samsung cell phone. please excuse any tpyos.

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: "david grahamcaso" <david.grahamcaso@lacity.org>
Date: Aug 17, 2016 1:46 PM
Subject: Fwd: Venice BID Questions
To: "Debbie Dyner Harris" <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>
Cc:

Can you please send this to the BID consultant to get her help with the answers? Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Melanie Camp <mel@yovenice.com>
Date: August 17, 2016 at 1:09:20 PM PDT
To: david.grahamcaso@david.grahamcaso@lacity.org
Subject: Venice BID Questions

Hi David,

I have several questions regarding the BID. The information you provided, coupled with the information/misinformation flying around raises a couple of issues that need clearing up.

I'm interested in Mike's opinion, as well as your own, on any or all of these.

If I use these they will be part of a larger, more balanced piece that includes everything good about a BID so feel free to add anything that hasn't already been said in the information you sent through before....

Is the voting structure fair? On the surface it seems that the owners who make up the majority of the total value of property are in support of the BID. How can a person who owns a small studio off the Boardwalk have their vote count against an entity as large as, say for example, Venice Breeze Suites?

A lot of the land is owned by the city. Does the city get a vote?

I've come across one lady, an 88 year old artist, who says she won't be able to afford the assessment on her live/work studio. What happens in cases like this?

Why are the boundaries of the BID so specific?

Why not just form an Ocean Front Walk BID?

Why not blanket the entire area of Venice?

Is there a risk that crime and grime will migrate off the Boardwalk and out of areas within the boundaries of the BID to other parts of Venice?

Is the public hearing being held on the last day of voting? If so, why was the decision made to schedule it this way?

Thank you so much.

Mel

Melanie Camp
Yo! Venice
Managing Editor/Staff Writer
685 Venice Blvd, Venice CA 90291
Cell: +1.702.334.2921
Download the City of Los Angeles MyLA311 app for smartphones!

MyLA311 links Angelenos with the services and information they need to enjoy their city, beautify their community and stay connected with their local government. With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away.
5.42 Exhibit 42 – June 28 2016 Tara Devine/Rick Scott exchange re BID Trust Fund
Re: BID Trust Fund
1 message

Mon, Jul 27, 2015 at 6:28 AM

Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rosemary Hinkson <rosemary.hinkson@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>

Any funds, if available, for new establishment or renewal (expansion or not) would have to be recommended by the Council office where the BID is located. The BID Trust Fund is generally used for new establishment. The Council offices' also provide for renewal or establishment from sources they have access to.

On Fri, Jul 24, 2015 at 10:23 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Quick question:
If an existing BID is considering a sizable expansion, can it seek matching funds from the BID Trust Fund?
Or are those funds available only for new BIDs?

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org
5.43 Exhibit 43 – August 5 through 12 2016 Email exchange re William Kuel’s property
Download the City of Los Angeles MyLA311 app for smartphones!

MyLA311 links Angelenos with the services and information they need to enjoy their city, beautify their community and stay connected with their local government. With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away.

Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>  
To: exnihilo65@verizon.net  
Cc: Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie Dyner Harris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Wed, Jul 27, 2016 at 6:13 PM

Dear Mr. Kuel,

Please find attached the response letter from the Office of the City Clerk. The original will be sent via USPS.

Thank you.

Rita

On Wed, Jul 27, 2016 at 2:23 PM, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org> wrote:
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Letter to William & Laura Kuel.pdf  
726K

Christy Numano-Hiura <christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>  
To: Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Thu, Jul 28, 2016 at 12:38 PM

Hi Holly, in responding to your / the property owner's question of what suggestions or options they may have regarding the proposed assessment of their apartment complex, I am going to assume that the engineer's report properly analyzes the proportionate special benefit for each parcel in the district.

Short of retaining their own attorney, the property owners can utilize the ballot process (and vote 'no') and submit their protest at the hearing pursuant to PBID law. Hopefully this helps.

Christy
[Quoted text hidden]

Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>  
To: Christy Numano-Hiura <christy.numano-hiura@lacity.org>

Thu, Jul 28, 2016 at 3:29 PM

Thanks.

[Quoted text hidden]

William Kuel <exnihilo65@verizon.net>  
To: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>  
Cc: Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie Dyner Harris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Fri, Aug 5, 2016 at 9:15 AM

Thank you for your response.

One question, at this point:

The letter from Shannon Hoppes dated July 27, 2016 says our letter will be forwarded "to the engineer who determined that the property will receive special benefit from the Venice Beach Business Improvement District."

If the engineer determines that our residential property does not, in fact, receive "special benefit" from the BID, does he/she have the authority to remove our parcel from the assessed list or recommend same?
For that matter, what is the criteria to determine “special benefit?”

Thank you,
Bill & Laura Kuel

[Routed text hidden]

Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>  Fri, Aug 5, 2016 at 2:16 PM
To: William Kuel <exnihil65@verizon.net>
Cc: Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Kuel,

Pursuant to Proposition 218, assessments for special benefits must be supported by a detailed Engineer's report. It defines “special benefit” as “a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large.” The special benefits for parcels in this proposed district are listed in the Management District Plan and Engineer's Report (ER). We are forwarding the ER to the Engineer to ensure that he is supporting the special benefits listed for your parcel.

The Engineer and the consultant, Devine Strategies, can assist you with more specific questions. Ms Tara Devine is copied on this message for follow-up.

Thank you.

Rita

[Routed text hidden]

William Kuel <exnihil65@verizon.net>  Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 8:56 AM
To: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>
Cc: Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Thank you Ms. Moreno.

Can you (or anyone CC'd in this email) please provide me the phone number and/or email address of the engineer (whom I presume to be Edward V. Henning)?

Bill Kuel

[----- Original Message -----]
From: Rita Moreno
To: William Kuel
Cc: Shannon Hoppes ; Debbie DynerHarris ; Miranda Paster ; Tara Devine ; Holly Wolcott
[Quoted text hidden]

Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>  Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 9:48 AM
To: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>

--------- Forwarded message --------
From: "William Kuel" <exnihil65@verizon.net>
Date: Aug 8, 2016 8:56 AM
Subject: Re: Proposed Venice BID & Residential Properties Zoned Commercial
[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 4:12 PM
To: William Kuel <exnihil65@verizon.net>
Cc: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>, Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Dear Bill:

It has been some time since we last spoke, but I wanted to respond to your most recent questions. Please keep in mind, as we discussed during the petition stage, it is zoning and not use that guides assessment district formation. In many communities across California, zoning and use are not consistent. Conditional uses, legal non-conforming uses, variances, etc. are also all part of the landscape that causes differences between zoning and use.

1) No, neither the Engineer nor I can remove your parcel from the proposed BID.
2) Here are some excerpts from the Engineer’s Report that address the special benefits conferred on your multi-tenant residential use property (zoned commercial):

- “Special benefit” as defined by the California State Constitution means a distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the District or to the public at large.

- The property uses within the boundaries of the BID that will receive special benefits from BID funded programs and services are currently a mix of commercial, industrial, government and residential. No parcels within the District are zoned solely residential. Services, programs and improvements provided and funded by the BID are primarily designed to provide special benefits as described below to identified assessed parcels and the array of land uses within the boundaries of the District.

- For residential parcels and residential portions of mixed use parcels within the BID (all located on commercial or industrial zoned parcels), it is the opinion of this Assessment Engineer that each of these parcels and uses specially benefit similarly to commercial/industrial parcels, from the clean and safe and district identity and special project programs designed to improve the cleanliness, security, marketability and livability of these parcels and residential units on them. Since the majority of residential units within the Venice Beach BID are used as business enterprises, live/work units, rental units, or vacation rental units whether single family units, apartments or residential condominiums, it is the opinion of this Assessment Engineer that each residential unit shall be treated as an existing or potential for-profit business enterprise, live/work unit, rental unit, or vacation rental unit. As such, the proportionate special benefits conferred on all residential parcels and units shall be considered similar to those conferred on commercial/industrial parcels within the Venice Beach BID. For these parcels, BID programs, services and improvements are designed to increase residential rental occupancies, rental income and return on investments. These programs, services and improvements are designed to improve commerce, security and aesthetic appeal for tenants, visitors and landlords of these parcels within the Venice Beach BID by reducing crime, litter and debris and increasing the safety and attractiveness of residential rental units within the BID and the nearby array of tourist related goods, services and activities, all considered necessary in a competitive properly managed tourist-based business district.

Please let me know if you’d like to discuss this further.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

[Quoted text hidden]

William Kuel <exnihilo65@verizon.net> Thu, Aug 11, 2016 at 12:10 PM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>, Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Thanks for your follow up, Tara, we appreciate it.

I understand that we will receive a "special benefit" under the engineer's definition; however, no more so than all the other completely-residential properties in the BID zone surrounding us that will be exempt because they are lucky enough to be zoned R1, including the numerous apartment units being run as short-term rentals in contravention of the spirit, if not law, of LA's rent control laws.

Simply put, the laws, propositions and bureaucratic rules we face being zoned C4 put us in a uniquely disadvantaged position as far as the Venice BID is concerned. We find this completely unfair, particulary as there is no apparent mechanism to appeal our particular situation before any governmental or regulatory agency.

We are not eligible for the "Just and Reasonable Rent Adjustment Program" and cannot afford to seek historic designation given the massive cost it would entail to restore our fourplex back to 1910 (not to mention the likey drop in market value we would face with such a designation).

We’ve begun to look into seeking a zone change to residential, but as we’re not developers, the process appears extremely onerous and has no guarantee of success. If you know of anyone we could consult with to find out if this is at all a viable option, we would be much obliged. We don’t want to beat our heads against the wall and spend all kinds of time and money if this isn’t a realistic possibility.

Thank you,
William & Laura Kuel.
[Quoted text hidden]
To: William Kuel <exnihilo65@verizon.net>, Ezra Gale <ezra.gale@lacity.org>
Cc: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>, Rita Moreno <ritamoreno@lacity.org>, Shannon Hoppes <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>

Hello William, if you would like to discuss a possible zone change, I’d recommend speaking with Ezra Gale, my office’s Senior Planner. He is very familiar with the process and the Venice area, and can help answer some questions. I have copied him here if you would like to reach out.
Debbie

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Debbie Dyner Harris
District Director
Councilmember Mike Bonin
City of Los Angeles
310-575-8461 | www.11thdistrict.com

---

Download the City of Los Angeles MyLA311 app for smartphones!

MyLA311 links Angelens with the services and information they need to enjoy their city, beautify their community and stay connected with their local government.

With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away.

---

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Debbie Dyner Harris <debbie.dynerhamis@lacity.org>
Cc: Holly Wolcott <holly.wolcott@lacity.org>, "Hoppes, Shannon" <shannon.hoppes@lacity.org>, Ezra Gale <ezra.gale@lacity.org>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <ritamoreno@lacity.org>, William Kuel <exnihilo65@verizon.net>

Bill:

I would second Debbie's suggestion to contact their planning deputy, who may also be able to contact you with the right folks at City Planning for your area. That's a great place to start for information (and it's free :)

Warmest regards,
Tara

[Quoted text hidden]
5.44 Exhibit 44 – August 23 2016 City Council Tara Devine speaker card
Date: 8/23/16

I wish to speak before the

Name of City Agency, Department, Committee or Council

City Council

The City Council’s Rules of Decorum Will Be Enforced.

Council File No., Agenda Item, or Case No.

#2

City Council

CF-16-0749

Do you wish to provide general public comment, or to speak for or against a proposal on the agenda? ( ) For proposal ( ) Against proposal ( ) General comments

Name: Tara Divine

Business or Organization Affiliation: Divine Strategies

Address: 645 West Ninth Street, #110-293, Los Angeles, CA 90015

Street City State Zip

Business phone: 310.430.5121 Representing: Venice BID Steering Committee

CHECK HERE IF YOU ARE A PAID SPEAKER AND PROVIDE CLIENT INFORMATION BELOW:

Client Name: Venice BID Steering Committee

Client Address: 8461702 Avenue, Venice, CA 90291

Phone #: 310.392.4687

Please see reverse of card for important information and submit this entire card to the presiding officer or chairperson.
5.45  Exhibit 45 – August 24, 2016 Melanie Camp article in Yo! Venice about Venice Beach BID
The Los Angeles City Council has voted to certify the creation of a Business Improvement District (BID) at Venice Beach.

In the special assessment district balloting, the BID was approved overwhelmingly, 77% to 23%. The City of Los Angeles, which has property in the BID area, supported formation of the BID, but even if the City had not cast its ballot, the BID would have been approved by a more than 2-1 margin.

"The Venice Beach BID will help create a cleaner and safer boardwalk for everyone to enjoy. BIDs are a commonly-used tool to help supplement public services for neighborhoods, and this BID will make it possible for us to expand the services that the neighborhood deserves. It is the kind of smart and effective public-private partnership we need," says Councilmember Mike Bonin.

Bonin has advocated for the creation of a BID since he was a candidate for City Council, often citing the added services a BID would bring Venice Beach — one of the most visited tourist destinations in the world.

However in the lead up to yesterday's approval of the BID many in Venice voiced concerns.

"During the approval process many people opposed to the BID, from inside and outside the assessment area, raised concerns about the BID. I have heard and respect those concerns, and I am committed to working with BID opponents to make sure that the BID is a vehicle that celebrates what it is special about Venice — its funky character, its diversity, and its tolerance of people of all walks of life," says Bonin.
Critics were afraid that the voting structure was not fair. However Bonin says it was consistent with the voting structure “used for each of the 42 BIDs and special assessment districts across Los Angeles and the hundreds of BIDs and special assessment districts throughout the state. The voting process complies with state law, and is done this way so that votes are based on how much property owners will be asked to pay into the BID.”

Since the City of Los Angeles owns land within the Venice BID boundaries it was able to vote. “State law says that public/government parcels are not exempt from assessments, and since anyone who will be assessed gets a vote, the City is allowed to vote based on the total value of the property it owns within the BID boundaries,” says Bonin.

Bonin says that State laws prevent gerrymandering. “The Venice BID boundaries were determined based on the same rules as every other BID, which excludes any residentially-zoned land (but includes commercially-zoned, industrially-zoned and government/public facilities-zoned parcels). The BID proponents decided to include all of the property that is eligible for assessment west of Abbot Kinney (which already has a Merchant's Association that functions similarly to a BID). This is consistent with state and local law.”

As far as concerns that the BID will push crime and grime off the Boardwalk and into residential areas of Venice, Bonin says, “the goal is not to push the problem elsewhere, but to provide a safer community for everyone. We will not tolerate an approach that sweeps people off of the Boardwalk into nearby neighborhoods, and the goal here is to provide a safer and cleaner neighborhood for everyone to enjoy.”
5.46 Exhibit 46 – South Park BID payments to Tara Devine in 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Invoice Number / Payment Reference</th>
<th>Disbursement Reference</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>07/22/14</td>
<td>7.22.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,015.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>08/12/14</td>
<td>P14081101 - 0389566</td>
<td>013EXAILG5020</td>
<td>($ 1,015.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans &amp; Horner</td>
<td>01/23/14</td>
<td>1/23/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 888.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>02/12/14</td>
<td>P14021101 - 1301259</td>
<td>3831104</td>
<td>($ 888.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>08/24/14</td>
<td>8.24.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,823.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>09/10/14</td>
<td>P14091101 - 2355697</td>
<td>5339541</td>
<td>($ 2,823.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>09/14/15</td>
<td>8.24.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,710.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>09/14/15</td>
<td>P15091101 - 8327582</td>
<td>8857435</td>
<td>($ 1,710.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Robles</td>
<td>12/09/13</td>
<td>12.9.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 171.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>12/24/13</td>
<td>P13122301 - 9459194</td>
<td>3619651</td>
<td>($ 171.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine Strategies</td>
<td>12/05/13</td>
<td>SPSG13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>12/24/13</td>
<td>P13122301 - 9459253</td>
<td>3631616</td>
<td>($ 5,075.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>03/10/14</td>
<td>SPSG14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>03/27/14</td>
<td>P14032601 - 3289880</td>
<td>4176426</td>
<td>($ 5,075.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>04/18/14</td>
<td>SPSG15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>05/09/14</td>
<td>P14050701 - 5300582</td>
<td>4474482</td>
<td>($ 5,075.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>07/31/14</td>
<td>SPSG16</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>08/12/14</td>
<td>P14081101 - 0389656</td>
<td>5137511</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>09/02/14</td>
<td>SPSG17</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Invoice Number / Payment Reference</td>
<td>Disbursement Reference</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>09/10/14</td>
<td>P14091001 - 2366773</td>
<td>5357448</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>10/03/14</td>
<td>SP5G18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>P14101301 - 4539731</td>
<td>0:SBTB2ROPE6AOPO</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>11/21/14</td>
<td>SP5G19</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td>P14121201 - 9308950</td>
<td>0:SEQUPOH6TZNH</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>03/01/15</td>
<td>SP5G21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>04/14/15</td>
<td>SP5G23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>04/15/15</td>
<td>P15041401 - 0366552</td>
<td>0:SUSPICON9CT99</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>04/20/15</td>
<td>SP5G24</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>04/29/15</td>
<td>SP5G25</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>05/13/15</td>
<td>P15051201 - 3097541</td>
<td>01SWYQAOZAI3FF7</td>
<td>($ 11,250.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>05/28/15</td>
<td>SP5G26</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>06/19/15</td>
<td>P15061801 - 749953</td>
<td>01SQUQZESL81VF3</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>SP5G27</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>08/21/15</td>
<td>P15081201 - 4382125</td>
<td>015HOVMDJH0XKE</td>
<td>($ 4,875.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>08/25/15</td>
<td>SP5G20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>08/25/15</td>
<td>SP5G22</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>P15082801 - 6430049</td>
<td>015EGGEEQTD9ZAW</td>
<td>($ 3,750.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>10/08/15</td>
<td>SP5G28</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-EFT</td>
<td>10/26/15</td>
<td>P15102301 - 1879157</td>
<td>015OACRJTYE.J54S</td>
<td>($ 2,500.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirango LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>11/05/15</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pmt-Bill.com-Check</td>
<td>11/12/15</td>
<td>P15111101 - 2963026</td>
<td>9570785</td>
<td>($ 3,380.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.47 Exhibit 47 – April 29, 2015 emails between Tara Devine and Miranda Paster about qualifications
Re: RFP

7 messages

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>, "Hinkson, Rosemary" <rosemary.hinkson@lacity.org>

Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 1:36 PM

You will need to get on our list of qualified consultants. I will ask Rick to send you the old RFQ information.

The RFP isn’t ready yet. Eugene will set up a meeting w/ the BID proponents first.

On Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 12:37 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

By the way -
You probably know this, but I would be interested in responding to any RFPs you issue for BIDs forming for 2017. I'm starting to line up my BIDs for next year.

I saw this:
and figured I should drop you a note just in case I'm not on a "list!"

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

---
Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <rosemary.hinkson@lacity.org>

Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 3:14 PM

2011 RFQ attached

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>
Date: Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 1:36 PM
Subject: Re: RFP
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>, "Hinkson, Rosemary" <rosemary.hinkson@lacity.org>

You will need to get on our list of qualified consultants. I will ask Rick to send you the old RFQ information.
5.48  Exhibit 48 – June 17, 2016 emails between Tara Devine and Miranda Paster about strategy
Fwd: Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/17/16
5 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 5:11 PM
To: Miranda Paster <Miranda.Paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Just FYI, updated petition threshold below.

Also, I think we have the database okayed or darn close. Garen asked us to add some language to the MDP/ER to elaborate on the methodology used. Ed submitted this language last night; I did not see a reply from Garen today unless I was not cc’d, but I will proceed with my MDP edits (I don't believe our numbers will change) over the weekend, and will find out when Ed can complete his. I know Ed is out Tuesday for medical (Diane.) So my hope is to have revised MDP/ER done on Monday; if not, it could be Wednesday.

At the appropriate time, I am happy to request that CM Price’s office waive this item (or support your request if you prefer to make it.) Marisa has been kind enough to help me in the past. I also have a good relationship with the CM and another member of his staff. I can also help with CP Wesson’s office at the appropriate time, if desired.

Have a great weekend!

Warmest regards,
Tara

----------- Forwarded message -----------

From: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 5:02 PM
Subject: Venice Beach BID petitions: 6/17/16
To: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>

Today's petitions - three in one file
One petition/two parcels is the now-complete Sherman, Russell petition (previously incomplete/provisional)
Plus two more condos that appear fully complete to me.

If all three of these are valid, I have us at 51.67%. (1.26% provisional)
I have more I expect next week - almost 4% at minimum (Metro, Thornton Venice, Tramco)

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org> Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 10:52 AM
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
Cc: Rita Moreno <Rita.Moreno@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <Rosemary.Hinkson@lacity.org>

Good Morning Tara.

I hope that all is working well for you. At the appropriate time, we can request the chair of Economic Development Committee to waive the item if necessary. The question is why does it need to be waived from Committee given that the Ordinance of Establishment for this report will not be adopted in time to make the County tax rolls (deadline 7/15/16)? We can not schedule anything in Council or Committee without a reviewed and approved MDP/ER (which we do not have yet) nor can we request the City Attorney to sign the Ordinance of Intention. In addition, having the public hearing in Committee will ensure that it moves quickly in Council. We will have more than enough time to hand invoice
the assessments without having the item waived from Econ. Dev. Committee. Thank you for the offer to call the Council office, we do not believe that it is appropriate for a Consultant to request the Committee to waive the item.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

--
Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>  
Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:22 PM  
Hello Tara.

As mentioned in our phone conversation, I checked on South Park II. The Ordinance of Intention (OOI) was adopted by Council on 5/20/15 and the public hearing was set for July 28, 2015 with the Ordinance of Establishment (OOE) adopted by Council on 7/29/15. The OOE was scheduled on a special agenda before the Summer recess, but Ccl didn't hold the members to consider the special agenda items. If it had, the OOE could have been adopted in time to make the County deadline of 7/15/15. It didn't make that deadline and was scheduled for 7/28/15.

For the proposed Venice BID, we are past the dates that South Park II was adopted. The Venice OOI will be going to Council around the time that the OOE was adopted for South Park II. If everything moves forward (petition requirement, review of MDP/ER, City Atty signs OOI, Clerk Report & Scheduling of matter before Committee 72 hours in advance), and the matter is adopted by Committee on 6/28/16, the matter would have to go to Council on Friday, July 1, 2016. A placeholder could be made. However, these dates are still past the dates of South Park II's initial OOI adoption. We can rush everything, but everything is dependent on factors which would have to be completed by Wednesday 10 am (the deadline for getting an item on the agenda). Pursuant to State's Streets and Hwys Code and the Govt Code its requirement of a public hearing with 45 day notice, the OOE for Venice will not make the County's deadline no matter how we rush.

Thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:29 PM  
Ah, thank you. I understand the difference. This is, however, all the more reason why we are extremely anxious to get the OOI in before recess. We have lost many, many weeks at many junctures, and losing 3+ more here is going to put us in greater jeopardy of not being able to start services on Jan 1. I feel confident in saying that failure to start services Jan 1 is going to make CD11 and my client deeply unhappy. It will also disappoint all those who have signed petitions in support of the BID thus far - a really wide spectrum of large, mid-size and small owners.

I believe that, throughout this process, we have really worked VERY hard to expedite everything that has been asked of us, at all stages of this process. I would appreciate anything we can all do to get the OOI through before recess.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE  
DEVINE STRATEGIES  
645 West Ninth St.#110-293  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
310.430.5121  
tara@devine-strategies.com  

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES  
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts